FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 220

14 November 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Mikhaylov: INF Deployment Complicates MBFR Talks AA 1
'Flexible Response' Goal of INF Deployment AA 1
[Likhotal in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Nov]
U.S., Soviet START Delegations Meet 10 Nov AA 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

IZVESTIYA Carries Communique on Warsaw Pact Meeting BB 1
[13 Nov]
Appeal to CSCE Parliaments BB 2
[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]
TASS Reports, Kills Appeal BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 1
[Kachanov, Lavrentyev, Andrianov, Cheporov]
'Crime' Against Grenada Reviewed CC 1
U.S. Seen Exploiting Japan CC 2
Reagan Far East Trip Assessed CC 4
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 4
[Andrianov, Volskiy, Nekrasov]
INF Situation Assessed CC 4
Grenada 'Aggression' Condemned CC 6
Mideast Situation Reviewed CC 8
U.S.-Japanese 'Alliance' Eyed CC 9
U.S. Missile Plans Depicted CC 10
UN Assembly Condemns Israeli 'Nuclear Blackmail' CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Foreign Ministry Denies U.S. Microwaves Charge A 1
[PRAVDA 13 Nov]
Senate Approval of Military Appropriations Scored A 1
[Tsarev in PRAVDA 11 Nov]
Demonstration Against Reagan Foreign Policy Noted A 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

President Reagan Ends Visit to Japan, South Korea C 1
'Protests' Held in Japan [Kalyagin] C 1
Diet Speech 'Hypocritical' [Bogachev] C 1
U.S. 'Peacemaker's Mask' Hit [Biryukov] C 3
Korea Stop To Cause 'Strain' C 4
Reagan Arrives in Seoul C 4
Seoul Police, Students Clash C 4
Reagan Speech 'Attacks' USSR C 5
Talks End; Reagan Departs C 5
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Trip's Aims C 5
[Ponomarev 10 Nov]

WESTERN EUROPE

Commissions Approve Finnish Treaty Extension G 1
[PRAVDA 5 Nov]
Kohl, Thatcher 'Close' Grenada Issue G 3
Kohl's Asian 'Propagandist Exercise' Hit G 4
[Mnatsakanov]
Antimissile Protest Held in Greek City G 5

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: U.S. Picks Syrian Targets H 1
[12 Oct]
TASS: U.S. Planning Provocations Against Syria H 1
SANA Cited on Syrian Fire Against U.S. Planes H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

TASS: U.S. Envoy Talks in S. Africa About Namibia J 1
Cape Verde Party Delegation Visits 30 Oct-6 Nov J 1
[PRAVDA 9 Nov]
Bodyul Sees Off Guinean Premier Beavogui [PRAVDA 6 Nov] J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Ustinov Cites Andropov on U.S., NATO War Threat R 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Nov]
Andropov's Achievements in First Year Reviewed R 5
[Medvedev in Stockholm DAGENS NEHETER 7 Nov]
Grishin Visits Moscow Construction Projects R 9
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Nov]
Academic Urges Changes in Court Procedures R 10
[Savitskiy in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Nov]
Shevardnadze Writes on Georgiyevsk Anniversary R 14
[PRAVDA 29 Oct]
Kapitonov Addresses 21 Oct Uzbek Aktiv Meeting R 19
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 22 Oct]

MIKHAYLOV: INF DEPLOYMENT COMPLICATES MBFR TALKS

LD101759 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] There has been a full-scale meeting at the Vienna talks on armed forces and arms reduction in central Europe. The chief Soviet delegate, Valerian Mikhaylov, said many months of negotiations had passed but the Western participants had given no reply to the socialist countries' constructive proposals aimed at reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. The planned siting of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, he added, would inevitably make it more difficult to scale down military confrontation in central Europe.

'FLEXIBLE RESPONSE' GOAL OF INF DEPLOYMENT

PM101625 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Likhotal "International Review": "Nuclear Ambitions"]

[Text] The October holiday has been celebrated as a symbol of peace and shining ideals by the working people of all continents of our planet. They demonstrated once again their support for the Leninist peace policy of the CPSU and our state. And on these very same days working people in Europe and the United States, Asia, and Africa, forming thousands-strong columns of demonstrators, protested Washington's crazy nuclear plans and the conciliationist policy of the NATO countries harnessed to it. And this is understandable, for in the coming month the United States is to give the West Europeans a "Christmas present" that it has long been preparing. We are talking about the deployment of their Pershings and cruise missiles in West Europe.

One of the main official motives for deploying the new missiles is "strengthening the security" of West Europe, or, in NATO jargon, "restoring the dependability of the Atlantic Security Zone's unity."

Striving at all costs to do their allies a "good turn," Washington politicians allege that the consequence of strategic parity in Soviet and U.S. military might has been the erosion of U.S. guarantees of West Europe's security. Simply put, under conditions of military balance the "self-preservation instinct" could restrain the United States from "defending" its allies in the course of a European conflict. This situation, so the story goes, has a negative effect on the flexible response strategy -- NATO's official military-political strategy, which is intended to ensure the nuclear restraint of "deterrence" of an enemy.

Thus, in order to correct the situation -- restoring the lost dependability of U.S. nuclear "guarantees" and increasing the effectiveness of the flexible response strategy -- it turns out to be necessary to deploy missiles in Europe and thereby make the threat of nuclear escalation more likely in the eyes of the potential enemy.

Of course, it is up to the Europeans whether to believe Washington's pledges or not, and, most important, to decide for themselves to what extent they really need "security guarantees" entailing a direct risk of the annihiliation of Europe. However, when pondering the reasons, goals, and possible consequences of NATO's "arms upgrading" decision, attention cannot fail to be drawn to its anti-West European thrust.

The prescription given to Europe by the transatlantic specialists is simple and straightforward. According to it the dependability of the flexible response strategy under conditions of strategic parity can only be guaranteed in the event of NATO, and in practice the United States, having the opportunity to use nuclear weapons at any levels and on any scale in Europe.

The central element in the flexible response strategy is the idea of escalation. It is this, according to the Atlantic strategists' schemes, that must harness the U.S. strategic forces to the "defense" of West Europe and guarantee "the Atlantic security zones' unity." The inevitability of nuclear escalation ought, on the one hand, to convince an enemy that America, having reached the pinnacle of the escalation spiral, will in the final analysis use its strategic forces, and on the other, dispel West Eurpopean fears of the possibility of a nuclear war limited to the continent. At the same time, this idea, without excluding the possibility of ending a conflict before it reached global war, is intended to reassure America that interference in a European conflict will not immediately and automatically entail a destructive strike against its own territory.

"In short,"(J. Thomson), leader of Rand Corporation's national defense research program, notes in this connection with an obvious piece of wishful thinking, "flexible response allows the allies to get along despite anomalies in the strategic situation."

In practice the escalation problem does not seem so unambiguous, especially in the eyes of Europeans. We are in practice talking about an increase in the ability to control a limited use of nuclear weapons. Against that backdrop the fact that the main emphasis is being laid on medium-range systems looks especially ominous.

The British researcher M. Kaldor is disparaging about assertions that the dependability of the strategy can allegedly be increased "by convincing the Russians that America's readiness to start a limited war is greater than their readiness to start a suicidal strategic war." She asks the rhetorical question: "Do they really expect to convince the Europeans of this too?"

The clearly unaccidental coincidence between the elaboration of the U.S. "superior countervailing strategy" and NATO's "arms upgrading" decision sheds some light on Washington's real goals. Presidential Directive 59 envisages the creation of effective capabilities for hitting military-political command centers, facilities directing combat operations, communications Centers -- the enemy's entire military-political infrastructure. These tasks are handled perfectly by medium-range systems. The high striking capability of cruise missiles and Pershings makes them effective weapons.

References can be found in Western literature to the existence of plans for increasing the missile's [as published] range to 4,000 km. Due to this it would be possible to use it against Soviet ICBM sites not only in the European part but also in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. Finally, according to certain data, the technical possibility exists of fitting the missile with guidance systems which would also make it effective against mobile systems.

NATO is also beginning to prepare public opinion for a Quantitative "transformation" of its December 1979 decision. And although at this time the West prefers to say nothing about this so as not to complicate implementation of the missile deployment plans, the Reagan administration is clearly working on the basis that the 572 missiles are only the start of "arms upgrading." These views were expressed, for instance, by U.S. Congressman Whitehurst at the NATO Military Committee session in May 1982. He stated that the agreed level of modernization does not take into account the possibilities and consequences of nuclear operations and also the probable losses in medium-range systems in the course of these operations.

In practice the new missiles, instead of strengthening the dependability of deterrence, guarantee that any U.S.-USSR conflict will begin with operations in the European theater.

If the probability that nuclear war might sidestep West Europe or only affect it insifnificantly was slight before, the creation on the West European Continent [as published] of targets for a first strike in the event combat operations start up introduces complete certainty into this problem. Is this in the interests of West Europe, for whose "security" NATO alleges that it is upgrading its arms?

As a number of bourgeois specialists admit, the Soviet Union's natural [zakonomernyy] reaction to the deployment of new U.S. missiles capable of reaching targets in the European part of Soviet territory in a few minutes might be to switch to a system of a automatically launching missiles on warning of an attack. Furthermore, many experts, including a group of Cambridge University scientists, do not rule out the Soviet Union being forced to equip its medium-range missiles with warheads powerful enough to ensure the possibility of the guaranteed destruction of the enemy's missiles in their zones of dispersal [v zonakh ikh rassredotocheniya]. Can this also be in the interests of West Europe interests with its very high population density? How can one fail to recall here W. Churchill's remarks on the creation of U.S. bases on British territory: "...In agreeing to the creation of an American nuclear base in East Anglia, we have turned ourselves into a target, and, I daresay, the 'bulls-eye' of the target for the Soviet Union."

Thus, the United States has the theoretical opportunity to turn nuclear war into an instrument of foreign policy by redistributing the level of risk between itself and its allies. As a result the shadow of a nuclear war limited to the framework of the continent, which has clouded allied relations only intermittently, is taking on increasingly tangible outlines.

So who, in the final analysis, needs these Pershings and Tomahawks in Europe? "From the captain's bridge in Washington," Yu.V. Andropov stresses in this connection in his statement, "the operation of installing these U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe looks like an extremely simple and most advantageous one for the United States -- advantageous as Europe's expense. The European allies of the United States are regarded as hostages. This is a frank policy, but a cynical one. But here is what is really incomprehensible: Is any thought being given to this by those European politicans who, disregarding the interests of their peoples and the interests of peace, are helping to implement the U.S. Administration's ambitious militarist plans?"

U.S., SOVIET START DELEGATIONS MEET 10 NOV

LD101416 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] Geneva November 10 TASS -- The delegations of the USSR and the United States to the negotiations on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments held a plenary meeting here today.

IZVESTIYA CARRIES COMMUNIQUE ON WARSAW PACT MEETING

PM121636 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

["Communique on the Meeting of Representatives of the Warsaw Pact Member States" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] On 9 and 10 November 1983, a meeting was held in Sofia of representatives of the parliaments of the Warsaw Pact member states deputies at the National Assembly of Bulgaria, the National Assembly of Hungary, the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic, the Polish Sejm, the Grand National Assembly of Romania, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia.

The perilous escalation of international tension in the world and the growing threat of a nuclear catastrophe as a direct result of the militaristic course of the U.S. Administration and its closest allies were noted with deep alarm and concern by the participants in the meeting. Special importance was paid to the situation in Europe in connection with the NATO plans to deploy on this continent new U.S. medium-range missiles pointed at the socialist countries. If the siting of these missiles, intended for a first nuclear strike, cannot be averted, this will bring about a fresh escalation of the nuclear arms race in Europe and a more perilous exacerbation of the entire international situation.

The participants in the meeting expressed their deep conviction that the reduction of the nuclear arsenals, based on the principle of equality and equal security, of consolidating the trust and developing international cooperation, corresponds to the interests of Europe, of each European country, and the hopes of all European peoples. They noted that the use of economic sanctions in the relations between states was contradictory to the principles of the Final Act of Helsinki.

The participants in the meeting found unanimously that in the present-day alarming situation the foreign political initiatives of the socialist states contained in the political declaration adopted on 5 January 1983 at the Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states and in the joint declaration of the Moscow meeting of party and state top workers of the seven socialist countries on 28 June 1983, were acquiring particular importance and urgency. These initiatives are aimed at averting the nuclear war, at continuing and strengthening the process of detente, at halting the arms race, especially the nuclear one, and proceeding towards disarmament, consolidating the security and cooperation in Europe and all over the world.

In the course of the meeting the participants stressed that today, like perhaps never before, ever more active efforts of the parliamentarians of all countries were needed in order to achieve tangible results at the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. They took a stand for the renunciation of the deployment in Europe of new U.S. nuclear missiles and for a radical reduction of the existing nuclear medium-range missiles, for complete freeing of Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. They expressed their readiness to act jointly with the parliamentarians of all participant states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe for the sake of attaining these objectives.

The participants in the meeting are deeply convinced that the widespread antimissile movement, the actions for disarmament and peace, are an illustration of the fact that the European peoples are well aware of the entire danger of the plans for the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear arms systems on the European Continent.

As a result of the meeting an appeal to the parliaments of the participant states in the all-European Conference on Security and Cooperation was adopted.

The meeting proceeded in a businesslike and comradely atmosphere, in a spirit of fraternal friendship, absolute mutual understanding, and unity of thought.

Appeal to CSCE Parliaments

PM121709 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Appeal to Participant States of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe"]

[Text] Sofia, 10 November -- We, representatives of the supreme legislative bodies of the Warsaw Pact member states -- the People's Assembly of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the State Assembly of the Hungarian People's Republic, the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic, the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic, the Great National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic -- gathered in Sofia to discuss topical international issues, especially in connection with the dangerous situation on the European Continent, deem it our duty, in expressing the will of our peoples, to address the parliaments of the states-participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe with the following message:

In the balance at this critical juncture is the question of whether Europe will take the road of reducing the levels of nuclear arsenals or the road of a further massive arms buildup. Deployment, prepared for the near future, of new U.S. nuclear missiles on European soil will, should it come to pass, be a step hostile to the cause of peace.

We regard as the most important and urgent task for the Europeans and all people of goodwill the prevention of such a dangerous course of events that would lead to a further, even greater increase in tensions, and to a greater threat of a nuclear catastrophe. It is in their interests to prevent transformation of the territory of the West European countries into a launching pad for U.S. missile-nuclear weapons aimed at the socialist countries, and to remove the nuclear threat from Europe and to strengthen security on our continent and the whole world.

The goal and the essence of the line that has been and is being persistently pursued by the socialist countries in questions of nuclear arms limitations and reductions in Europe, is attainment of agreement. They advocate this most cardinal solution: a total removal from Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. This proposal tabled by the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks, would, if implemented, be in full accord with the fundamental interests of the European peoples, with the tasks of strengthening universal peace, international stability, and cooperation.

Acute now as never before is the question of rapid achievement at talks not limited by any arbitrarily established deadline, of a mutually acceptable agreement providing for a renunciation of deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and for a radical reduction in the existing medium-range nuclear means.

In working for an end to the nuclear arms race, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries came up with the number of major and bold initiatives aimed at a deep and radical cuts in nuclear arms on an honest and just basis, genuinely taking into account the security interests of each side, including the Soviet proposal to scrap all the missiles falling under reductions. These initiatives are a direct bridge leading to agreement.

Deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles on the European Continent would place in jeopardy all the positive achievements made possible by collective efforts within the framework of the all-European process, whose prospects of further development were recently defined at the meeting in Madrid. In positively assessing the results of the Madrid meeting, we consider it to be especially important at present that all European states work for their consolidation. Taking into account the constructive results of the 5th inter-parliamentary conference on questions of security and cooperation in Europe, we advocate an activisation of the interaction between the European parliaments.

We are convinced that it is still possible to reach agreement. What is needed in order to achieve this is only the political will, the readiness of both sides to be guided unswervingly by the principle of equality and equal security, to observe only one indispensible demand: The balance of forces in Europe in terms of medium-range nuclear armaments must not be disrupted. This balance must be based not on the nuclear arms buildup but on the reduction of nuclear armaments to ever lower levels.

When solving this most acute problem, it is essential that parliaments taking into account the views of the broad sections of the population, should make their contribution to averting grave danger which threatens Europe and the whole world, the more so since this question is of vital importance for every country, for Europe as a whole, for the entire human race.

On behalf of the parliaments of our countries we appeal to the parliaments of the participating countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, whose voice must be heard with the insistent call to make a weighty contribution to the achievement of effective nuclear disarmament, to do everything within their power to ensure for peoples a future free from anxiety. Reason must triumph.

TASS Reports, Kills Appeal

LD112335 Moscow TASS in English 2223 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Text] Sofia November 11 TASS -- The prepared development of new U.S. nuclear missiles on European land, in case it is implemented, will be a step hostile to peace. This is said in an appeal to the parliaments of the participating countries of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which was adopted here on Thursday at a meeting of representatives of the parliaments of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Soviet Union, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The parliamentarians of the Warsaw Treaty member countries expressed the conviction that preventing such dangerous developments that would lead to still further growth of tension, to the aggravation of the threat of nuclear catastrophe is the most important and pressing task of the Europeans and all people of good will.

The document contains the call to prevent the turning of the territory of West European countries into a launch pad for U.S. nuclear missile weapons targetted on socialist countries, to avert nuclear threat from Europe, to strengthen security on the European Continent and all over the world.

"We are convinced that it is still possible to reach agreement. What is needed in order to achieve this is only the political will, the readiness of both countries to be guided unswervingly by the principle of equality and equal security, to observe only one indisputable demand: The balance of forces in Europe for medium-range nuclear armaments must not be disrupted. This balance must be based not on the nuclear arms build-up but on the reduction of nuclear armaments to ever lower levels," the appeal of the parliamentarians says.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1946 GMT on 11 November carries a report on the appeal issued at the meeting of Warsaw Pact parliamentarians in Sofia. The English and Russian-language versions are identical except for the following:

[First paragraph, TASS Russian omits reference to the Socialist Republic of Romania.

[Last paragraph, TASS Russian omits final sentence.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 2038 GMT on 11 November transmits a service message killing the Russian-language version.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 2213 GMT on 11 November carries another version of the report, containing the reference to Romania and the final sentence in the English version]

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD111042 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 10 Nov 83

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program, presented by Yevgeniy Viktorovich Kachanov, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator; with Vyacheslav Georgiyevich Lavrentyev, All-Union Radio Caribbean Basin correspondent and commentator; Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio commentator; and Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov, APN political observer]

'Crime' Against Grenada Reviewed

[Excerpts] [Kachanov] We in the editorial are receiving many letters in which Soviet people express anger and indignation at the impudent U.S. invasion of the tiny Caribbean state of Grenada.

Pavel Andreyevich Tsukalov from Votkinsk, Udmurt ASSR, asks with legitimate indignation: Who has given Reagan the right to dictate to other countries his conditions, to speak in the language of threats and blackmail and to solve international problems from a position of strength? About people like Reagan it is said: This is a man with a prayer-book in his hands and with evil in his heart. We demand that the aggression be stopped and that the U.S. troops be withdrawn from the island.

Many letters contain the request to tell in greater detail about Grenada, its history and people.

I asked my colleague, commentator Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, who has worked as our correspondent for the countries of the Caribbean Basin and frequently visited Grenada, to answer all these questions. Over to you, Vyacheslav Georgiyevich.

[Lavrentyev] At present 115-118,000 inhabitants are living on Grenada, mainly blacks and mestizos. There are also descendants of Indians. Whites make up less than 1 percent of the population. Grenada is called the Spice Island, for the main crop is nutmeg; but tourism is the main source of income for the exchequer.

Formally, Grenada gained independence from Britain in 1976, but even before this one Gairy, who reliably guarded the British crown's interests, was in power in this country. He was absorbed in black magic and flying saucers. The fate of his own people, who were living in poverty and ignorance, did not interest him. On 13 March 1979 he was overthrown by a group of patriots headed by Maurice Bishop. In over 4 years revolutionary rule managed to do a great deal for the people. It provided them with free education up to secondary education. Medical aid became accessible to each Grenadian. In all municipalities first-aid posts and hospitals were built. Cuban specialists and doctors helped solve this problem. Cuban builders helped build an international airport which was to link Grenada with the outside world and help break the economic blockade organized by the United States. Cooperatives started to emerge in the country. The majority of Grenadians received the opportunity to work and, most importantly, the revolution awakened a fantastic enthusiasm among the masses and involved the working people in restructuring the entire style of life on the island. Grenada and its socioeconomic development contrasted favorably against the background of the other East Caribbean countries plunged into depression.

Reagan, the U.S. President, was afraid Grenada's neighbors might follow along the road taken by Grenada. That is why Washington decided to cut short the Grenadan experiment by force and sent in the U.S. Marines against the island.

I would also like to answer the question of what aid was given to Grenada by Cuba.

The presence of Cubans on Grenada, as you know, was used by the U.S. President to justify the American invasion. He claimed that the Cubans were building military installations, an airfield and others there, and allegedly that Cuba intended to turn the island into a bridgehead for expansion in that region.

With all the conviction of a man who has walked and travelled over the length and breadth of Grenada -- the whole islet is 33 km by 12 km -- I assert that this is a vile lie. Socialist Cuba gave the people of Grenada a great deal of aid in various spheres of the economy. Cuban specialists helped set up an agro-industrial complex and a fishing fleet. Cuba supplied Grenada with asphalt and cement works and a housebuilding combine. Cuban specialists also worked at them. Cuban doctors were helping solve the problems of the health service. One should not forget that an economic war, directed from Washington, was being waged against Grenada's revolutionary government. The Cubans are well aware from their own experience what this is like. That is why the internationalists, as the specialists working abroad are called in Cuba, put the utmost effort into their work in Grenada, displaying wonders of heroism. They also did not give in when crack American troops from the so-called Rapid Deployment Force poured down on them like a bolt from the blue. Yes, there was a small quantity of firearms on the island. This was to repel an attack by the mercenaries which were being gathered together in Florida by Gairy, the island's former dictator. At present, the Americans themselves admit that there were no more than 20 Cuban military advisers on Grenada. The others were civilian specialists.

But almost all Cubans are capable of handling firearms. In their homeland they train themselves to do so voluntarily after work, within the framework of civil defense. It is again the same United States, which does not cease to pursue an extremely hostile policy against socialist Cuba, which forces them to act in this way. For this reason, when Fidel Castro says that the Cuban people are ready to rise up in defense of the gains of the revolution this is entirely devoid of bravado. This is how it will be. The Cubans behaved courageously and staunchly during the American invasion. In the locality of Salines, where the airport was being built, the Cuban builders lived in wooden barracks situated on a hill, open to all winds. There were neither small trees nor folds in the ground where one could shelter. Nevertheless, they put up stubborn resistance to the American troops fitted out with the most modern equipment.

As the American generals now state, for the United States this was a proving ground to test the latest weapons.

The last time I was in Grenada was in March of this year for the celebration of the fourth anniversary of the revolution. I remember the immense enthusiasm of the people, and the happy, joyful faces.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Vyacheslav Georgiyevich. Indeed, there can be no other view. What the U.S. President has perpetrated against the people of this small country is a crime for which there is no justification.

U.S. Seen Exploiting Japan

[Kachanov] Judging by the letters reaching our program, listeners are noting that the policy of the Reagan administration, which is aimed at escalating the arms race, at whipping up enmity and tension between states, and kindling conflicts, is becoming increasingly dangerous and being extended to large areas of our planet.

We see, Andrey Mikhaylovich Tkalenko writes from Kharkov, how Washington is persistently trying to involve South Korea and Japan, following Western Europe, the Near East and Central America, in its adventurist strategy, thereby threatening peace and security in the Far East. Dorodnykh, a resident of the town of Krasnoyarsk, asks us to talk about the current development of relations between Japan and the United States, which dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. I shall ask our commentator Boris Yasilyevich Andrianov to meet this request.

[Andrianov] The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki lives on, of course, in the memory of millions of Japanese. Evidence of this is provided not just by the annual ceremonies commemorating the victims of the two atomic bombings but also by the massive anti-nuclear movement, which is supported in various circles of Japanese public opinion. Basically this movement is of an anti-American nature, since it is directed against the nuclear arms race unleashed by the United States, against Washington's militaristic course, and against the attempts of the Reagan administration to use Japan for this realization of its aggressive designs.

But the rulers of Japan take a completely different position. One does not have to look far for examples. Let us recall the practical attack by the United States on Grenada. This bandit-like action taken by a mighty power against a tiny, peaceful country aroused a storm on angry condemnation throughout the world, literally. Even inveterate allies of Washington, like British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, did not dare to support the U.S. aggression against Grenada and disassociated themselves from the policy of international brigandage being pursued by the present occupant of the White House. Only Jpaanese Prime Minister Nakasone declared that he understands the reasons for the invasion of the small island in the Caribbean by the Americans. In this way the head of the Japanese Government basically endorsed and supported the U.S. armed intervention against Grenada. Miyamoto, chairman of the Japanese Communist Party Central Committee, described the stand taken by Prime Minister Nakasone as shameful. I think one should note that this stand reflects the approach taken by official Tokyo to the entire range of military-political relations with Washington.

[Kachanov] At a time of unceasing economic crisis the growing contradictions between the competing partners could develop into a real trade war. This would naturally have a detrimental effect on all spheres of U.S.-Japanese ties.

[Andrianov] This is precisely what Washington would now like to prevent. Of course it is not motivated by good feelings for Japan but by self-interest prompted by far-reaching objectives and strategic calculations. By all accounts the Reagan administration feels that the problem of the trade deficit with Japan must be resolved in the interests of the United States by further militarizing this country, by getting it to increase its military spending and to increase its purchases of U.S. weapons. The White House obviously intends to kill two birds with one stone: Japan, which is busy stepping up its military might, will be obliged to relax its foreign trade assault on the United States, while American arms kings will obtain a reliable sales market on the Japanese islands. Washington hopes that as a result it will get a militaristic partner in the Far East capable of acting in accordance with the global strategic schemes of the U.S. rulers.

The visit by the U.S. President to Tokyo, which began last Wednesday, is evidence that the White House is thinking along these lines. Before the beginning of this trip Reagan declared that global problems will be the main topic at the forthcoming talks in the Japanese capital. This means, the Tokyo paper YOMIURI writes, that the master of the White House will seek a more active participation by Japan in U.S. strategy in the Asian-Pacific region, to which, as Reagan himself has stated, Washington attaches special importance.

Evidence of this is the interview which the U.S. President gave to the Japanese Fuji television company, in which he made a provocative call for the creation of a strong Japan. It is absolutely clear that in order to achieve this goal the head of the present Washington administration will demand that Japan forge ahead rapidly with its military preparations.

Reagan Far East Trio Assessed

[Kachanov] On Saturday, the U.S. President will wind up his visit to Japan. He will head for South Korea. International observers believe that the two destinations on Reagan's tour are linked by the general objective of the master of the White House.

[Andrianov] Briefly, the principal objective being pursued by the U.S. President is to speed up the completion of a military-political structure comprising the United States, Japan, and South Korea. The creation of this tripartite militaristic alliance, or Iron Triangle as it is called, has long been the basis of the plans of the Washington strategists, who have been dreaming of a bridgehead of aggression directed against the Soviet Union and other Far Eastern countries. All this is subordinate to Washington's wish to change the balance of forces in this region in favor of the U.S.

Reagan's Far Eastern trip gives the weightiest grounds for saying that the White House intends to extend the arms race to the Far East, thereby creating yet another hotbed of tension on our planet. After all, as Secretary of State Shultz, who is now accompanying the master of the White House, hinted, medium-range nuclear missile weaponry in Asia and the Far East, in particular, will be discussed in detail during the talks in Tokyo.

In this connection I will remind you that in its report, published recently in Washington, the U.S. Department of Defense bluntly described Japan as one of the most suitable condidates for the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles. By involving the East Asian countries in the Pentagon's global strategy and deploying mass destruction weapons, including first-strike nuclear weapons, at its Asian bases, the United States is hoping to avoid a retaliatory strike against itself by making its own allies face it and by turning them, like the countries of Western Europe, into nuclear hostages of Washington. Sober-minded circles in the Japanese public are realizing the real danger of such an outcome ever more clearly. Miyamotov, the leader of the Japanese Communists, declared that the invitation of Reagan, who is carrying out a policy of aggression and preparing to involve Japan in a limited nuclear war, to Tokyo is a betrayal of the interests of the Japanese people.

It is quite natural that during the days that the master of the White House is spending in Tokyo mass demonstrations of protest against the transformation of that country into a nuclear base for the United States should be spreading throughout Japan.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD131841 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 13 Nov 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program, conducted by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Boris Andrianov, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board member; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST international observer]

INF Situation Assessed

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello, comrades. Taking part in our roundtable meeting today are Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of the journal KOMMUNIST.

One could scarcely find in the world today a single person of common sense who would not agree that never before in the decades following the war has the international situation been as tense as it is now. And the appeal to the parliaments of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which was made by the representatives of the supreme legislative organs of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty, and which is published in our press today, is dictated by an understanding of this critical factor.

Imperialism has imposed upon mankind a race involving the most refined means of mass destruction, and now the question not simply of how to prevent a third world war but of how to preserve peace on earth faces all peoples with an unprecedented acuteness. We are dealing with an unprecedented growth in the aggressiveness of the policy of American imperialism throughout our planet. A clear example of this is the striving by the Reagan administration to deploy medium-range nuclear means in Western Europe at any price. It is for this reason that people of goodwill follow with such unrelenting attention reports from Geneva, where the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe are taking place.

[Nekrasov] The last weeks -- not to say days -- of the Geneva talks on nuclear arms in Europe are running out, and naturally the question arises of whether Washington will move to a continuation of the talks, which was proposed, as is known, by Moscow, and this on condition that the Pentagon will not begin to deploy new medium-range missiles. Of course, theoretically, so to speak, the possibility of this remains; by all accounts, however, in order that this may take place, a extremely serious shock is needed in the American capital which would compel those at the top in Washington to look critically at the policy they are implementing. For the moment we can say directly that such symptons are not being observed. Instead, launch installations for cruise missiles are being brought over to Britain.

[Andrianov] I think that one might also add the fact that the Pentagon is carrying out energetic preparations for the transfer of parts for Pershing II missiles to West Germany, too. In particular it is reported that as soon as the debate on this issue takes place in the Bundestag -- it is scheduled for 21 and 22 November, and it is evidently considered in Washington that Chancellor Kohl's government will manage by a formal majority to push through a favorable decision -- then the day following the debate the transfer of the Pershings to European soil will commence.

[Nekrasov] I should like to stress that all this is being done without waiting for the completion of the Geneva talks. All in all, this is what has to be said: All the cards have now been revealed; the positions of the sides are absolutely clear. The Soviet Union, occupying a position of principle, is at the same time displaying maximum flexibility. This was again confirmed in the recent replies by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov and PRAVDA questions. If our proposals were accepted the Soviet Union would have 140 of the so-called SS-20 missiles against 162 British and French missiles, that is to say, less than in 1976. If the NATO countries, and Washington in particular, were really disturbed by the Soviet missiles, then there is now every opportunity for achieving a mutually-acceptable accord. But, and this is main thing, Washington is clearly not interested in the quantity of Soviet missiles. It wants to deploy its own missiles as soon as possible and that's that. It wants to achieve military superiority as soon as possible. A futile hope, of course, but a very dangerous plan. Nevertheless, it continues to implement them.

However, even at this late hour Moscow is holding open the door to accords, and it is calling today for sobriety and realism, is seeking to achieve the removal of the threat of a new dangerous twist in the arms race, and is demanding that the principle of equality and identical security be observed.

But what about Washington? Washington is playing a propaganda game. Once again rumors are appearing in the press about allegedly forthcoming new American proposals at the talks. In any event, what is being reported by the newspapers does not inspire any optimism, because the main question, the question of taking the British and French missiles into account, remains untouched. Hence the only aim Washington has is that of confusing the public with showy flexibility and of trying to place the blame for the interrupting of the talks upon the Soviet Union.

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, it would be interesting to know how you think one ought to assess the possibilities that the antinuclear and antimissile movement has at its disposal today?

[Nekrasov] First I want to stress the fact that no matter what happens, the people involved in the antiwar movement intend to continue their struggle and to intensify it even more. A movement of the people like the present antiwar movement is not tied to concrete political events. It is brought about by causes which lie very deep, and it cannot be snuffed out by the stubbornness of the ruling people at the top in the imperialist countries in carrying out their policy. This movement unites different strata of the population, representatives of different political parties, and it breaks, so to speak, the structure of party policy now existing in the West. For example, this is what the West German DEUTSCHE VOLKSZEITUNG writes in this connection: The movement unites within its ranks more people than could be united by any political party of our country. The antimissile movement has become a major party of the people in the Federal Republic. And it goes on: Even if the first American nuclear missiles make their appearance upon our soil, the struggle will not be ended. I would put it like this: This present transfer of parts of Pershing and cruise missiles across the Atlantic is a stimulus for the antiwar movement, a stimulus for building up the struggle in new forms. What forms will it take? Let us wait and see: These forms, as we know, are born of life itself, of the struggle itself.

[Andrianov] And as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as you know, our country has an attitude toward the fate of peace, which is one of good conscience and responsible in the highest degree. But at the same time we know that one cannot joke with peace. If the United States starts to deploy new missiles in Western Europe, therefore, the Soviet Union will not sit by with its arms folded. As you know, preparatory work is beginning in the GDR and in Czechoslovakia for the deployment of operational-tactical missiles intended for a direct response to the deployment of batteries of Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe. The peoples of the countries of the socialist community have shown an attitude of understanding and approval to the responsive measures taken by the Soviet Union, evaluating them as timely and extremely necessary under conditions in which the U.S. imperialists are threatening a crusade against the world of socialism.

[Volskiy] Today we are talking about American policy in relation to the European Continent. It is being rebuffed and is, of course, alarming the world. And this is not surprising, because Europe is one of the centers of contemporary civilization.

Grenada 'Aggression' Condemned

But the invasion of small, far-off Grenada has alarmed people literally everywhere. They are not only indignant at this act of direct, open aggression against a sovereign state that is a member of the United Nations. What is even stronger perhaps is the disquiet for the entire system of international relations which Washington clearly is deliberately destabilizing with this step. It is no accident that it found itself in isolation on this question, even in NATO.

Britain, France, Italy and a number of other members of the Atlantic bloc condemned in one way or another the invasion of Grenada, although now it looks as if some of them have taken fright at what one might call their own boldness and are somehow softening their tone, if not beating a retreat.

Events in Grenada are not withdrawing backstage. The reason is understandable: After all, the seizure of Grenada was not an isolated action. It was essentially an act of aggression against all countries of the Caribbean Basin and Latin America. And it was only a link in a global chain.

The American press evaluates the intervention in Grenada as some sort of warning, for example, to Nicaragua, against whom there has long been prepared a similar type of direct or indirect intervention. An indirect one, to put it more correctly, is taking place even now. It is meeting sharp condemnation from the international community, and was again displayed at the UN General Assembly, where there is discussion of Central American affairs, and where the United States is once again in isolation.

[Nekrasov] Yes, it must be said that the results of the discussion of these questions in the Security Council and at the General Assembly -- I am talking about Grenada and Nicaragua -- have infuriated Washington. Kirkpatrick, that fellow-fighter of Reagan, one of the most inveterate hawks in the U.S. Administration, publicly accused the majority of UN members of being Soviet clients. But what I recall in this connection, comrades, is this: Just recently, 40 years ago, there was a conference in Moscow of ministers of foreign affairs of three powers: the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain, the main powers of the anti-Hitler coalition. At that conference, the then U.S. secretary of state, Cordell Hull, on the instructions of U.S. President Roosevelt, posed the question of creating an international organization to maintain peace. A memorandum presented by America at the conference said: A mechanism should be created which will be capable of ensuring peace for many decades. A system is needed which will permit a prevention of violation of international law, an organization which will allow weapons to be reduced to the minimum.

As you see, 4 decades ago the leaders of American policy were reasonable people, truly statesmen. As for the United Nations, which today unites 158 states, it has been turned precisely into what it was designed to be by its initiators, among whom was also the United States. And it is not the fault but the misfortune, evidently, of the present leaders of America that they have forgotten this and do not wish to remember it. For example, the invasion of Grenada. The UN Charter was violated in the most blatant manner. I am not even speaking about the fact that there was also a violation of the OAS Charter; that is their business. But in this matter there was a violation of those behests, those principles, which that organization should be guided by on the suggestion of Roosevelt, on the suggestion of the United States itself.

[Andrianov] In this connection it is indicative how the occupiers are behaving on Grenada. They are trying to stifle opposition at birth and to establish a puppet regime on the island.

[Volskiy] But, Boris Vasiliyevich, I should call it a regime on the El Salvador model. As you know, the pro-American regime in El Salvador is literally hanging by a thread, and the American protectors do not know what to do for them -- to send their regular combat units into El Salvador, or to seek some other way of saving their henchmen in power. Washington is looking for such ways, but is not finding them. So I think that in this connection the situation in El Salvador, and indeed in the whole of Central America is sort of symbolic: Without direct American occupation, as happened in Grenada, the United States cannot maintain its positions.

Mideast Situation Reviewed

[Andrianov] But in Grenada, Dmitriy Antonovich, the United States used its fleet to land assault troops and for air support, while in Lebanon the combat ships have been also used for fire support. The impression is being formed that the U.S. naval forces have become a direct world colonial policeman.

[Volskiy] Yes, one should dwell specially on this role of the U.S. Navy. It is a question primarily of aircraft carrier formations -- an aircraft carrier with several dozen aircraft, with a dozen cruisers, destroyers and other ships, and about 2,000, or a little less, 1,800, Marines on board. This is how a typical aircraft carrier formation looks. The United States has several such formations now roving the seas. I remember that at one time the phrase gunboat diplomacy was current; now we are seeing how this colonial diplomacy has emerged. With its aid it wants to scare all the developing countries which reject American diktat.

The intervention in Grenada was just such an example of intimidation, but the tactic itself, of threats from the sea, is what I should call a very cowardly tactic. It brings to mind attempts to strike blows from behind cover, even from round the corner. We have seen this in Lebanon, when the American ship-based artillery opened fire on the national patriotic forces hear the Lebanese coast. And now by these Lebanese shores there stands, for example, the big battleship New Jersey, which is capable of hitting targets at a distance of over 30 kms.

[Andrianov] Recently the American flotilla off the coast of Lebanon has been increased more than twofold, and the press is reporting preparations for a new aggressive action against Lebanon, against the Lebanese national patriotic forces.

[Volskiy] Yes, already the Marines in particular, which are in Lebanon as part of the so-called NATO multinational forces, have, in the past few days, opened fire on the Lebanese. The tension is so taut that it is difficult to assess the situation there, but a number of circumstances are obvious. First, Washington is clearly striving to turn to its advantage, to use as a sort of cover, the clashes between various Lebanese forces and between various groups in the Palestinian movement in the north of Lebanon. This is a manifestation of the usual American line, the usual American method, which was applied in particular in Grenada. Second, the strategic interaction between the United States and Israel -- which is now not only occupying southern Lebanon, but also carrying out incursions, in particular, into airspace beyond this zone -- is now being strengthened. Third, and this is very dangerous, Syria, which it has long wished to shift from its independent course, has become a target. Finally, all this is plainly being coordinated with other U.S. imperialist designs in the neighboring region, in the oil-rich area of the Persian Gulf. There Washington evidently intends to exploit the Iran-Iraq war as a pretext.

So here we can visibly see the links of the same militarist chain in U.S. policy, from Grenada to the Near and Middle East, and even, one may say, to the Far East, to which President Reagan has just made a journey.

[Andrianov] What was it specifically that drew the master of the White House to the Far East? Washington's official announcement said that the present journey by the head of the U.S. Administration is designed to reaffirm the importance which that region holds for the United States. But if we discard the verbal camouflage of such a formulation, it will be seen that the Reagan team regards the Far East as one of the main arenas of military-political confrontation with the USSR. And the fact that this is precisely the situation is evidenced, in particular, by the provocation involving the South Korean aircraft, arranged by Washington for 1 September.

U.S.-Japanese 'Alliance' Eyed

[Nekrasov] Boris Vasilyevich, in the view of U.S. political observers, Reagan, during his Far East tour, intends to give final form to his Pacific Ocean doctrine. Moreover, this intention of the master of the White House, is also being linked with his pre-election calculations.

[Andrianov] Anyone thinking this is hardly doing truth a disservice, for Reagan himself imagines himself to be a major world politician, although in his own field he has given absolutely no proof of this. Meanwhile, the third year of Reagan's presence in the White House is coming to an end, and all the indications are that he is desperately eager to remain President for a second term. But how is he to achieve re-election if, in fact, he has simply nothing to boast of? How can he make an impression on the American voters? It is probably that in Reagan's understanding they ought to believe that the current President is no ordinary occupant of the White House, but an outstanding political figure. This, we must suppose, is the point at which he had the idea -- or perhaps someone else suggested it -- of acquiring his very own foreign policy doctrine. There are some other things that, supposedly, the master of the White House can get by without, but you cannot possibly do without a personal doctrine if you count on holding on to the presidential armchair.

I do not presume to judge whether Reagan's name will be attached to the Pacific Ocean doctrine, or whether it will help the head of the present Washington administration in the pre-election struggle; I will only note that the essence of that doctrine boiled down to a drive by Washington to give the United States the role of the leading Pacific power, aspiring not only to restore, but also to extend significantly its former positions in Asia, so as to interfere actively in the affairs of the countries of that continent.

[Volskiy] Boris Vasilyevich, it seems to me that we should add this: the trade and economic aspect of this tour. After all, on the very eve of Reagan's departure, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote: Even officials of the U.S. Administration acknowledge that President Reagan's visit to Japan is the best example of an ill-chosen time. What is meant by this? Serious tension now exists in U.S.-Japanese trade.

[Andrianov] In order to decide whether the time for Reagan's visit to Japan was correctly chosen or not, I suggest it is necessary to determine the aim with which the master of the White House planned to set off for Tokyo. It is of course indisputable that a great number of problems exist in Japanese-U.S. relations; there is above all a sharp deterioration in economic relations. However, plans for the Reagan tour did not by any means include, for example, the task of discussing the problem of the huge U.S. deficit in trade with Japan, although by the end of the current year this may reach an unprecedented, record level of over $20 billion.

The U.S. President is troubled by quite different worries, and everything indicates that one of these is concern for the further fate of Nakasone, the Japanese prime minister. Reagan desperately needs Nakasone. It is no accident that the American journal BUSINESS WEEK remarked that many in the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party consider that, even without Washington's pressure, Nakasone attends very closely to U.S. interests, and if he gives up too much in the name of friendship with Reagan he may find himself in the position of receiving more support in Washington than in Tokyo. Is it really surprising that Reagan himself declares his intention of doing everything possible to keep Nakasone in power?

[Nekrasov] Quite so. After all, it was none other than Nakasone, speaking on behalf of Japan, who energetically supported, and continues to support, plans to deploy U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. At the Williamsburg conference he was the one who showed willingness to link his country to Washington's militarist course and the activities of the aggressive NATO bloc. And it was this same Nakasone who gave a promise to the present U.S. President to turn the Japanese archipelago into an unsinkable aircraft carrier.

[Andrianov] And on the bridge of this aircraft carrier, if I may put it this way, Reagan desires to see only Nakasone. The present Japanese prime minister suits the U.S. strategists, and it is clear why. Here, for example, is what Robert Long, the U.S. admiral who formerly commanded U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific and Indian Oceans regions, stated in an interview with THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR: He stressed that the United States and Japan are now implementing measures which were politically impossible 4 years ago, and not only impossible politically, but impossible militarily too.

Tokyo's militarist cooperation with Washington has increased steeply. Japan's navy and air force are energetically developing practical interaction with the Americans. Suffice it to say that this autumn joint U.S.-Japanese exercises were held, during which the task of closing three of the most important international straits -- the La Perouse, Korean, and Tsugaru straits -- was tackled, so as to bar the Soviet Navy's way to the Pacific in the event of a crisis. This is only one of many examples which confirm that the Reagan administration considers U.S.-Japanese relations as the crux of its anti-Soviet course in the Far East.

[Volskiy] Judging by reports from Tokyo, all this has been fully reflected at the negotiations which the master of the White House held in the Japanese capital with Prime Minister Nakasone. Reagan set forth the idea of setting up a Pacific alliance.

[Andrianov] Yes, in Washington's planning it is meant to replace the present bilateral American-Japanese alliance, set down in its time in the notorious Security Treaty. That treaty's framework no longer satisfies the strategists across the ocean, it no longer corresponds to the White House plans to draw Japan actively into the global expansionist policy of the United States, for the Security Treaty envisages joint military action by the two countries only in case of an attack on the territory of Japan. But Washington's intentions are quite different. According to the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, in compliance with the American plans, Japan is now obligated not only to make a political and economic contribution to the realization of the Pacific Doctrine announced by Reagan, but also to take upon itself an active military role. One may, incidentally, notice that, according to the Japanese press, among the key points in the talks between Reagan and Nakasone were questions directly concerned with the build-up of the militarist potential of the Seoul regime and the growth of links in the framework of a military-political structure of the United States, Japan and South Korea. One gets the impression that the White House is in a hurry to complete the creation of such an Iron Triangle which the Washington strategists have long been dreaming of, hoping to obtain a launching ground for aggression aimed at the Soviet Union and other countries in the Far East. Reagan's militarist calls met, as was to be expected, complete understanding on the part of the Japanese prime minister.

U.S. Missile Plans Depicted

[Nekrasov] Boris Vasilyevich, here it is pertinent to recall that literally on the eve of Reagan's trip, Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state, speaking at a press conference, quite openly hinted that in the Tokyo talks there would be a detailed discussion of the question of medium-range nuclear missiles in Asia, and in the Far East in particular.

[Andrianov] Mr Shultz obviously knows what he is hinting at. He at the moment accompanies the boss of the White House, and he, of course, knew the program for the talks. True, in Tokyo they avoid talking at any length about this topic, for very understandable reasons. And in any case, the crux of the matter is not so much with Tokyo, where all action is taken under the motto: Please the Americans; it is with Washington, where Japan is openly called one of the most suitable candidates for the deployment of American cruise missiles. The White House does not conceal its intentions to change the balance of forces in the Far East in favor of the United States. This is why Reagan's current trip gives every ground for speaking about Washington's intentions to spread the arms race to the Far East, thereby creating one more hotbed of tension on our planet.

In dragging the countries of East Asia into the global strategy of the Pentagon, the strategists across the ocean are, of course, pursuing perfidious aims: by deploying weapons of mass destruction at their Asian bases, the United States is hoping to secure for itself a greater chance of survival in a nuclear war. They clearly gratify themselves in the White House with the hope of deflecting a retaliatory strike from American territory, making it fall instead of their allies, and turning them, like West European countries, into Washington's nuclear hostages. The very real danger of such an outcome is more and more clearly understood by sober-minded circles of the Japanese public.

It is only natural that in those days when Reagan was in Tokyo a wave of mass manifestations of protest against turning this country into a U.S. nuclear missile launching ground swept over Japan. The antimilitarist movement in Japan is one of the currents which are merging together into a common struggle conducted by the peoples of the world against a military threat.

At this point we conclude our roundtable meeting. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrade radio listeners: good-bye, and best wishes.

UN ASSEMBLY CONDEMNS ISRAELI 'NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL'

LD110316 Moscow TASS in English 2329 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] New York November 10 TASS -- The 38th session of the U.N. General Assembly has condemned Israel's nuclear backmail with regard to Arab states. The session has passed a resolution to this effect by an overwhelming majority of votes. The resolution, which has brought to an end the discussion of the question of the consequences of the armed aggression staged in 1981 against Iraqi peaceful nuclear installations, emphasises that Israel's constant threat to make a raid on nuclear plants in Iraq and other countries and to destroy them are a flagrant violation of the U.N. Charter and of the provisions of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The U.N. General Assembly, having confirmed its demand that Israel abandon blackmail and threats, is asking the U.N. Security Council to consider the question of necessary measures to prevent Israel's new attacks on nuclear plants.

FOREIGN MINISTRY DENIES U.S. MICROWAVES CHARGE

PM141025 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "Farfetched Complaints"]

[Text] Moscow November 12 -- Several years ago the U.S. press raised an uproar about some "microwaves" allegedly beamed at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. That inspired "case," as was to be expected, was invented artificially for the purpose of introducing complications to Soviet-U.S. relations. The unseemly undertaking was convincingly exposed and, it would seem, the question was finally closed.

However, in recent days the U.S. Embassy again raised a complaint about some "beams." The true motives of another propagandist fuss are indicated already by the fact that embassy spokesmen immediately released to the U.S. press all sorts of speculations on that score. In other words, this is an obvious attempt at stirring up yet another anti-Soviet campaign.

Today the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a statement to the U.S. Embassy. The statement points out that a check-up carried out by Soviet competent organizations has established that assertions as to alleged microwaves beamed at the embassy building do not have any grounds.

It is pointed out that, as has been already explained to the U.S. side, the existence of a certain electromagnetic field which is possibly registered in the embassy is the result of the operation of Moscow's industrial enterprises, just as is the case in any city. The level of the field is considerably lower than the safety norms adopted both in the USSR and the United States itself and presents no danger whatsoever to health.

The harmless nature of the electromagnetic field in the area of the U.S. Embassy was also officially confirmed by the U.S. side itself on the strength of special measurements and surveys carried out by it.

The statement resolutely turns down complaints about so-called microwave beaming of the U.S. Embassy building in Moscow as totally unfounded. The fact that the embassy nonetheless returns to this far-fetched question, which has long been virtually closed, and the obvious attempts to create a stir around it in the press are qualified as an attempt at introducing additional complications to relations between our countries.

SENATE APPROVAL OF MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS SCORED

PM111303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[Oleg Tsarev's "Commentator's Column": "On the Rails of Militarism"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate has passed the fiscal 1983-84 military appropriations bill with an unprecedently high total of $252 billion. Since the House of Representatives passed a similar bill a short time before, the Senate decision clears the way for a new round of Washington's militarist preparations. Apart from all else, the Pentagon's arsenal will be replenished this year with new nuclear first-strike facilities -- the MX ICBM's, the Trident submarine-based system, and the B-1 strategic bomber.

The size of the military budget represents the expression in monetary terms, as it were, of the U.S. ruling circles' imperial aspirations. Through the arms buildup, the Pentagon is trying to secure military superiority for the United States. Washington politicians would like to dictate their will in many regions and countries of the world. What would international relations be like if that happened? There is no need to look far for an example. The reprisals against sovereign Grenada are an indication of how the United States would like to refashion the world American-style.

The excessive military spending, however, weighs as a heavy burden on the U.S. economy. And it is primarily the poorest strata of the population that suffer. The Moloch of militarism is depriving them of their unemployment benefits and poverty allowances, food stamps, and housing subsidies.

The inflated growth of military production is hampering the development of other sectors of the industry. The budget deficit is increasing, and with it the U.S. state debat. State loans are keeping bank credit interest rates abnormally high. Through the currency and credit mechanism, the United States' partners on the other side of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, too, are drawn willy-nilly into financing the U.S. war machine.

In the "iron triangle," as the military-industrial complex is sometimes described in the United States, the U.S. Administration's political ambitions, the military industry bosses' craving for profits, and the Pentagon generals' "professional" interests are closely intertwined. They have one egoistic class interest in common -- to grab as much as possible, to stop the forces of progress which put up opposition to the creeping imperial encroachments of U.S. imperialism, and to prevent other peoples and states from developing freely and independently. Whole regions of the earth are declared "spheres of vital U.S. interests," and then military facilities are built up on a threatening scale to uphold these quite unjustified claims and the danger of a nuclear war is heightened.

The socialist countries and all the planet's peace-loving forces resolutely oppose the imperialist expansion of the latter-day pretenders to world supremacy. The militarists' plans and actions are angrily denounced by all people of goodwill.

DEMONSTRATION AGAINST REAGAN FOREIGN POLICY NOTED

LD131215 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 13 Nov 83

[Text] Washington November 13 TASS -- A massive demonstration in protest against the Reagan administration's foreign policies has been held in the nation's capital. More than fifty thousand people marched through Washington streets chanting, "U.S. troops, out of Grenada, Central America, and Lebanon," "Hands off Nicaragua," "Stop American missile deployment in Europe." A meeting near the White House was a culmination of the march.

Prominent political figure Jesse Jackson, who is seeking the Democratic Party presidential nomination, said they gathered here to voice their protest against the position of strength policy, against the Reagan administration's attempts to destablise the situation in Nicaragua, and against the dangerous growth of militarist sentiments in the United States. Lesley Cahan, a prominent public figure, has called for an immediate unification of all progressive forces of the United States and establishment of a new coalition opposed to war, racial discimination, unemployment and poverty. It is only through concerted effort, she said, that it is possible to alter the current course of events.

The authorities sent police units against the demonstrators.

PRESIDENT REAGAN ENDS VISIT TO JAPAN, SOUTH KOREA

'Protests' Held in Japan

LD111820 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Text] And now a commentary by political analyst Boris Kalyagin on President Reagan's visit to Japan. This is what he writes:

News reports on the visit are reminiscent of those from a theater of military action. Warships block the sea approaches to the international airport where the presidential aircraft landed. Strict control was imposed over all types of transport. The state residence that housed the master of the White House was guarded by 7,000 policeman with a a total of about 100,000 servicemen and policemen not counting 150 secret agents from the United States mobilized to ensure President Reagan's safety.

The Nakasone government had expected mass manifestations of protest against the arrival of its guest from across the ocean and its apprehensions were not ungrounded. Anti-Reagan demonstrations involved many thousands of people in Japan. It's quite understandable why the Japanese people decided to disregard the rules of Oriental hospitality. The stance taken by Ronald Reagan had come to symbolize international outrage. Japan is the first country the United States President has visited since the strangling of free Grenada. Obviously he is not averse to repeating the Grenadian experience in Asia. He wants to show that the United States has got rid of the so-called Vietnam syndrome. In fact Washington desires to erase from human history the recollection of the shameful defeat sustained by the American imperialists in the jungles of Indochina and to launch another military adventure. And it assigned Japan the role of its henchman who is expected to give aid in ensuring greater maneuverability for American's armed forces in the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

There are also plans to create a military alliance in the Far East with the involvement of the United States, Japan and the South Korean regime. The White House is seeking to make the Japanese Government take upon itself the same military commitments as those assumed by Wasington's NATO partners. But the example of Grenada has clearly shown what dangerous consequences military partnership with the United States might entail. In critical situations Washington takes decisions with no consideration for the opinion of its allies and often even without consulting them. And it is not likely to reckon with Japan more than it did with, say, Britain at the time of the events in Grenada.

Washington and Tokyo are banking on receiving political dividends from the current visit. Japan is on the threshold of parliamentary elections and Mr Nakasone hopes to consolidate his positions with the aid of Washington. In its turn the White House is anxious to create at least a semblance of success for its foreign policy. So both sides link many schemes with Mr Reagan's visit, but all these schemes are hopelessly removed from the interests of peace and security and from the national interests of Japan itself. And it's not surprising therefore that the people of Japan gave the visitor from across the ocean a reception that was far from being hospitable.

Diet Speech 'Hypocritical'

LD112252 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

President Reagan's recent speech in the Japanese Parliament will probably leave an indelible mark in the memory of the listeners by the "salesmanship" he displayed in the way

he raised important questions and by his disappointing manner of evading answering them. The President's statement abounded in omissions, half-truths, and crude distortions of facts.

For one thing, Reagan asserted that at the talks in nuclear arms in Europe the United States "proposed to destroy a whole category of arms". In the process, however, the President chose not to elaborate on the fact that the "whole category" subject to scrapping under U.S. proposals includes only Soviet medium-range weapons with the U.S. keeping all its weapons intact.

Sharing with his audience his dream "to live to see the day when nuclear weapons have disappeared from the face of the earth", Reagan, faced with the Japanese audience, could not bring himself to repeat his recipe for "reducing" the means of mass destruction by building them up to an unprecedented level. He even failed to mention altogether in his statement his absurd ploy of "disarming through increasing armaments".

Pretending a hypocritical concern for the wellbeing of the Japanese people, the U.S. President even tried to falsify facts in an attempt to convince the audience of the existence of an alleged threat to Japan from the USSR. We must not accept and shall not accept any agreement, he said, that would have the effect of shifting the threat posed by longer-range nuclear missiles from Europe to Asia.

In the meantime, Reagan must be well aware of the fact that should a mutually acceptable agreement be reached, including a U.S. commitment to give up deployment of missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union would scrap all of its missiles subject to cuts in the European part instead of redeploying them in the east. Moreover, the Soviet Union has announced that the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern parts of the USSR would also be halted if an agreement is reached on nuclear arms limitations in Europe.

Reagan could show his genuine concern for the Japanese as well as other peoples by giving up plans to deploy U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles in the immediate proximity of the Soviet Union and by agreeing to a complete parity in Europe between the nuclear forces of NATO and those of the Warsaw Treaty both in the number of missiles and planes and in the quantity of nuclear warheads on these carriers.

Ronald Reagan's statement in the Japanese Parliament closely coincided with his third anniversary in office. Three years ago Reagan still believed that he could openly expound his lunatic ideas that talking to the Soviet Union would be feasible only upon attainment by the United States of an eight-fold edge in the number of strategic missiles, and his ideas of creating a fortress America dictating its will to the whole world.

Times have changed, and Reagan, who quite recently spoke about a "limited nuclear war" being possible and a nuclear conflct admissible, has now been forced to pose as a peacemaker and to discourse in the Japanese Parliament on the impossibility of winning a nuclear war and to allege his readiness to conclude an "equal agreement" on nuclear arms.

Regrettably, as is evidenced by the U.S. Administration's practical steps, however, it is only the rhetoric of the President's public statements that has changed. Ronald Reagan's maniacal obsession with the possibility of an armed confrontation with the socialist countries has not changed. As the talks in Tokyo have confirmed, the U.S. President still manifests a glaring inability to make a sober assessment of the likely implications of his course of preparing for a nuclear war.

U.S. 'Peacemaker's Mask' Hit

LD111412 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 11 Nov 83

["He's Sporting a 'Peacemaker's' Mask" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes: The first, Japanese, act of the spectacular political show called "President Reagan's Asian Tour" is coming to a close. The President's aides, with their minds firmly fixed on preparations for the forthcoming election campaign next year, have, it appears, done everything so that, right after the U.S. aggression against Grenada, which was outrageous in its disregard for the standards of international law, and amid the anti-American rallies sweeping Japan, to present Reagan in the most favourable light, as "an envoy of peace and prosperity". But even the dove's feathers that the U.S. President displayed so artistically in the Japanese isles could not conceal the hawkish essence of the policy conducted by the Reagan administration throughout the world, in particular in the Asian Pacific region. Confrontation with the forces of peace and progress, the escalation of the arms race, especially the nuclear race, in a bid to gain military superiority and manage the world's affairs as it sees fit, and the fomenting of international conflicts in the hope of weakening some countries, while bringing others under its control -- such are the mainstays of Washington's policy.

There is every ground for contending that, after this has been done with Western Europe and Central America, the United States has now decided to enlist also Asia, first of all economically-strong Japan, in this perilous policy of adventurism. This is borne out by the results of Reagan's visit to Japan as well as the program of his stay in South Korea where he leaves for tomorrow. Let us corroborate this conclusion with press comments. The newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN which is close to Japanese ruling circles said: "The United States has explicitly demonstrated its desire to attach signal importance to Asia and the Pacific... [TASS ellipsis] Henceforth Japan and the United States will have to defend peace and prosperity in Asia by joint efforts. This constitutes the new meaning of the Japan-U.S.A. axis."

If the usual propaganda tinsel is peeled off, then what the paper meant was that from now on Japan will have to play an even more active part in U.S. aggressive preparations in the Asian Pacific that are not only directed against the USSR and other socialist countries but also at odds with the interests of other Asian states which went peace and stability in the region.

The American press bluntly admitted that "Reagan has succeeded in persuading the Japanese to assume more military commitments," binding themselves not only to intensify military preparations in their country but also to "defend sea lanes" passing 1,000 miles away from its shores. Washington's plans to form a military and political alliance including the United States, Japan and South Korea are beginning to be implemented in practice. The United States is making step-by-step efforts to set up in East Asia bridgeheads for aggression not only against the USSR but also against China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic. Washington is fulfilling plans to deploy U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons in that region so that to be able to evade the retaliatory blow itself by exposing its allies to it.

The Japanese people are aware that their country's growing part in efforts to carry out Washington's strategic military plans and the equation of Japan in its military and political commitments to the NATO members are getting Japan ever deeper involved in the American strategy of global confrontation and straining its relations with neighbouring countries.

The Japanese opposition parties summed up the content of Reagan's talks in Tokyo as "being at variance with the ideals of peace." The newspaper TOKYO SHIMB'N said today that "Japanese-American cooperation should not be hailed without reservations. Peaceful Japan should not sail implicitly in the wake of U.S. strategy that makes emphasis on confrontation from positions of strength."

Korea Stop To Cause 'Strain'

LD121601 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 12 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS -- There is every reason to believe that President Reagan's trip to Seoul "will aggravate the situation in the Far East, whip up the race in both conventional and nuclear arms in the region, strain to a new limit the situation in the Korean peninsula explosive as it already is, and heighten the threat to peace and security in that region of the world", the newspaper IZVESTIYA writes in its International News Review tonight.

Reagan Arrives in Seoul

LD120544 Moscow TASS in English 0526 GMT 12 Nov 83

[Text] Tokyo Number 12 TASS -- The United States President Ronald Reagan arrived in Seoul today after a three-day visit to Japan. The principal aim of his visit to the south of the Korean peninsula, as the Japanese press reports, is to discuss matters aimed at forming a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul militarist alliance and at giving additional aid to the puppet regime of Chon Tu-hwan.

Reagan's visit will be taking place in an atmosphere of a virtual "state of emergency" in South Korea. Chon Tu-hwan has announced the alerting of the 600,000-strong army. The U.S. Command has ordered to cancel all leaves for officers and men of the 40,000-strong U.S. occupation corps stationed in South Korea. For fear of mass demonstrations, the Seoul authorities, as the KYODO news agency reports today, imprisoned many political opponents of the anti-people regime on the eve of Reagan's arrival. Troops and police have been brought into the territories of higher learning establishments where anti-American demonstrations were held incessantly. All the main administrative institutions in Seoul are being guarded.

Seoul Police, Students Clash

LD112330 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Text] New York November 11 TASS -- The UPI news agency reports from Seoul that clashes between armed police units and students from the local universities protesting the visit to South Korea of the U.S. President Reagan, due to begin on Saturday, have been going on there for two days. With the help of arrests, police clubs and tear-gas grenades, the Seoul authorities try to prevent the holding of anti-American demonstrations during the visit of the head of the Washington administration, to bring down the opposition to the South Korean dictatorial regime.

UPI stresses that the streets of Seoul are patrolled by reinforced police details. Buses with radio communication equipment and with sharp-shooters in combat alert drive by the streets in the centre of the city. All the passers-by in the districts adjoining the building of the U.S. Embassy are stopped by the police patrols and searched.

Reagan Speech 'Attacks' USSR

LD122313 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1612 GMT 12 Nov 83

[Excerpts] Tokyo, 12 Nov (TASS) -- President R. Reagan, continuing his Far East tour, arrived in Seoul today from Tokyo. His visit to South Korea, which, like his talks in Tokyo, is regarded as another step by the U.S. Administration on the path of creating a triple aggressive military-political bloc, is surrounded with extraordinary security measures. At the order of Chon Tu-hwan, the head of the puppet clique, the 600,000-strong army has been put in a state of "higher combat alert." The command of the U.S. occupying corps, which amounts to 41,000 men, has cancelled all leave and vacation for American officers and men. The Seoul authorities, as the KYODO news agency reports today, threw political opponents of the regime behind bars on the eve of Reagan's arrival.

As he left on his foreign trip, Reagan stated in an interview with the South Korean KBS radio and television company that his administration intends to increase the number of troops deployed in South Korea and to step up their combat might.

The Washington intrigues for stepping up military links in the Washington-Tokyo-Seoul triangle are being implemented under cover of the worn-out invention of the "Soviet threat." It is not by chance that hardly having got out of his aircraft in Seoul, Reagan immediately spoke in the National Assembly making low-caliber anticommunist inventions. He made crude attacks on the Soviet Union, with overt threats addressed to the DPRK. The speech by the head of the U.S. Administration was imbued through and through with the aspiration to whip the militarist hysteria reigning in the south of the Korean Peninsula, and to raise tension in the region to the extreme. It is indicated that during his 3-day stay in South Korea, Reagan intends to inspect the U.S. and South Korean troops stationed in the region of the Demilitarized Zone, which cannot be evaluated as other than a provocative step.

Talks End; Reagan Departs

LD140556 Moscow TASS in English 0546 GMT 14 Nov 83

[Text] Tokyo November 14 TASS -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan has completed his visit to South Korea and left for Washington today. During his stay in Seoul, he held talks with the South Korean strongman, Chon Tu-hwan. Their talks demonstrated just one more time the aggressive nature of the U.S. imperialist strategy in the Far East.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Trip's Aims

PM101640 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 83 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Observer's Notes": "Why Reagan Has Gone to Asia"]

[Text] Yesterday U.S. President R. Reagan set out on a 5-day trip to the Far East, during which he intends to visit Tokyo and Seoul.

The voyage by the head of the present Washington administration has elicited many commentaries in the world press. The point is that U.S. relations with Japan and South Korea are made up of many aspects -- political, economic, military -- and they are of both regional and global significance.

And all these problems will undoubtedly be touched on to one degree or another at the talks with both Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone and Chon Tu-hwan, head of the South Korean regime. But commentators unanimously believe that the American President will concentrate attention on military-political questions above all.

This certainly does not mean that Japanese-American relations are developing in an unclouded manner in the economic sphere, say. No, there are more than enough contradictions between the two countries here, and they sometimes assume the very acute forms of a "textile," "motor vehicle," or some other, "war." But now, for a number of reasons, both sides have decided not to concentrate their attention on them. First, in 2-3 days of talks you still cannot resolve problems which have built up over long years. Second, both sides deem it necessary to demonstrate the success of the visit and unity on the questions discussed. And third, the leaders of both countries, and probably the United States above all, see it as their chief task to raise to a new, qualitatively high level the relationships that exist between them as allies, which are based on the notorious Japanese-American "security treaty" and have recently been supplemented by a number of other agreements and accords.

It should be emphasized here that the starting point for Washington's policy in the Asian and Pacific region is its unconditional subordination to the U.S. ruling circles' globalist aspirations and to their policy of aggravating confrontation with the Soviet Union and the socialist world as a whole. The present American administration would like to see Japan if not as its chief ally then at least as just as reliable a partner as the leading NATO countries. At the same time people on the other side of the ocean increasingly frequently regard the Japanese islands as a bridgehead for preparing an aggressive war against the USSR and other socialist states and as a launch position for the deployment an, ultimately, the use of American nuclear weapons, including medium-range weapons designed to inflict a first strike.

But still this is not all. Ultrareactionary U.S. imperialist circles, whose aims the Reagan administration fulfills so zealously, are working increasingly openly to form a new global military-political alliance, a new military coalition spearheaded against the Soviet Union. And one of the leading roles in this coalition is allocated to Japan. Here Washington takes into consideration its mighty economic potential, its military-strategic location near the Far Eastern borders of the USSR and a number of other socialist states at a point where very important sea and air routes cross, and the expansionist aspirations of Japanese monopoly capital and influential political circles.

This is why politicians and strategists on the other side of the ocean are trying so persistently to achieve Japan's faster militarization, the strengthening of its military potential, and the increasingly close involvement of the country's so-called "Self-Defense Force," that is, its Army, Air Force, and Navy, in American military plans and in practical cooperation with the U.S. Armed Forces. In this connection it is possible to point out, in particular, that probably with none of their allies do the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force hold so many joint military exercises and maneuvers on various scales as with Japan. The agreement concluded on the eve of Reagan's visit to Tokyo to pass on to the Pentagon advanced Japanese technology "needed to improve the U.S. defense potential" was a new step on the way to "hitching" Japan to Washington's militarist chariot. As the press reports, it is a question of technology for the production of optical communications devices and electronic and other apparatus used in creating new weapons systems.

Well, what is the attitude of the Land of the Rising Sun itself to all this? As for the public and the broad people's masses, their attitude is sharply negative.

Japan's progressive forces advocate liquidating the "security treaty" with the United States and strictly observing the antiwar provisions of the country's constitution and the three nonnuclear principles -- not to have, import, or produce nuclear weapons -- and oppose the growth of militarism. But the Japanese ruling circles advocate widening the military alliance with the United States, increasing military spending, and building up the Armed Forces' strength. This policy has been embodied in the fact that Japan has assumed responsibility for guarding marine communications within a radius of 1,000 miles from Tokyo and has expressed readiness to blockade three very important international straits -- La Perouse, Korea, and Tsugaru -- "in the event of a crisis situation." Nakasone's statement of readiness to use the Japanese islands as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" has become the talk of the town.

Particular public concern has been aroused by Japan's subscribing to the statement on military questions adopted by the other six major capitalist powers at the Williamsburg conference last summer. Observers rightly evaluated that act as Japan's direct complicity in the U.S. militarist policy and the activity of the aggressive NATO military-political bloc and as its "Atlanticization," so to speak.

Yielding to Washington's pressure, Tokyo has recently increased its role appreciably within the framework of the military-political structure which the United States is creating in the Far East -- an alliance directed against the socialist states. This is manifested particularly noticeably in the strengthening of ties with Chon Tu-hwan's terrorist dictatorship in South Korea. Japan has granted the Seoul regime major credit to the tune of $4 billion, a sizable proportion of which is being used to strengthen South Korea's military potential and to expand war preparations. Japan's complicity in the militarist activity being conducted on the Korean peninsula by Seoul in conjunction with the command of the American troops stationed there can only be regarded as the knocking together of a triple alliance in the Far East under Washington's auspices.

South Korea is generally allocated a significant place in the U.S. global strategy. The Pentagon would like to see the 600,000-strong South Korean Army as an instrument for realizing its far-reaching aggressive designs. American military aid to Seoul and deliveries of modern types of weapons and combat hardware are increasingly yearly. At the same time the territory of South Korea remains a major bridgehead for American Armed Forces. Some 40,000 U.S. servicemen, large American air forces, and up to 700 nuclear charges are deployed there.

In the light of the visit which President Reagan has begun to Tokyo and Seoul it is becoming quite obvious that the plans to form a U.S.-Japanese-South Korean military-political structure are entering the final stage of realization. In East Asia Washington is creating at an intensified pace a bridgehead for aggression not only against the Soviet Union but also against the PRC and the DPRK. Ak a press concerence held on the eve of the President's departure U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz pointed out that "substantial attention" during the upcoming talks "will be devoted to security problems," and he hinted that in Tokyo "there will be a detailed discussion of the question of medium-range nuclear missile arms in Asia, and in the Far East in particular."

What should be said in this connection? It is known that there are American nuclear weapons not only in South Korea. They are kept at several bases in Japan itself and are on board U.S. naval ships attached to Japanese ports. And recently the question of deploying medium-range nuclear weapons near the Soviet Far East has been increasingly actively under discussion in Washington.

Here, just as in West Europe, these will be strategic weapons with regard to the Soviet Union. At the same time the deployment of American nuclear weapons, including first-strike weapons, at Asian bases could, in the opinion of politicians and strategists across the ocean, safeguard U.S. territory itself against a counterstrike by exposing their own allies to one. Thus, Washington is setting a nuclear trap not only for the peoples of West Europe but also for Pacific countries, preparing for them the sad fate of hostages and victims of its global strategy.

The boss of the White House also has certain other plans connected with the voyage which has begun. "Despite the acute situation over Grenada and in the Near East and also the approaching presidential election," the Japanese newspaper MAINICHI wrote in this connection, "the head of the American Administration is devoting close attention to the Asian and Pacific region." Why is this? It is very simple, MAINICHI replies: "Reagan is clearly seeking to score extra points in the foreign policy sphere by securing the support of his Far Eastern partners."

Yes, finding himself practically isolated even from many of his own allies after the aggression committed against independent Grenada, Reagan is obviously in dire need of "extra points." But will he get them as a result of his trip?

It should be emphasized that the visit by the head of the White House to Asia is of an undisguised anti-Soviet nature and pursues the aim of still further exacerbating tension in the Far East and worsening Japan's relations with the Soviet Union. Of course, militarist circles will only welcome such a development of events. But, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov warned in his 28 September statement, those who are making efforts to revive Japanese militarism and to hitch it to NATO's military-political machine are endeavoring to make people forget the lessons of the past.

But the peoples have good memories. And they see that the desire to reduce international relations to military rivalry -- a desire which can be seen in every pact by the leaders of the Washington administration -- is clearly reflected in the immoral, cynical, aggressive essence of imperialist foreign policy as a whole. They see that the United States is making a new dangerous attempt to gather into a single fist all the forces of the old world against all the forces of freedom, independence, and progress.

The development of events in the world arena, the ceremonial session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses devoted to the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution emphasized, demands of Soviet people the greatest vigilance, self-control, firmness, and unflagging attention to strengthening the country's defense capability. The Soviet Armed Forces are equipped with all they need to ensure that no one is tempted to mount a trial of strength. No attempts to encroach upon the Soviet motherland or its allies and friends will take the USSR unawares. And this must be well known to the makers and champions of the hegemonist policy which Washington now holds in such esteem and to which it would like to bind other countries -- both to the west and the east of the Soviet Union.

COMMISSIONS APPROVE FINNISH TREATY EXTENSION

PM091444 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 83 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Peace and Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] A joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities was held in the Kremlin 4 November. The session considered the protocol between the USSR and Finland signed in Moscow 6 June this year on extending the term of the 6 April 1948 Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Treaty which has been submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for ratification. As is known, the Finnish Parliament has unanimously approved this protocol.

The following took part in the session's work: K.U. Chernenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Soviet of the Union Foreign Affairs Commission; B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CSPU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commission; V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and CPSU Central Committee Secretaries M.V. Zimyanin and K.V. Rusakov.

A.P. Shitikov and V.P. Ruben, respectively chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities, and T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, were present at the session.

The session was chaired by K.U. Chernenko.

V.F. Maltsev, USSR first deputy foreign minister, delivered a report at the session on behalf of the Soviet Government.

The protocol, he said, has been signed in Moscow as the result of talks between Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Finnish President M. Koivisto. The protocol provides for the extension of the 1948 treaty in unaltered form for a new 20-year period, that is, through 2003.

The fact that the Soviet-Finnish treaty is being extended for the third time now and, moreover, once again ahead of schedule -- it was extended for the first time in 1955 and then again in 1970 -- graphically shows that experience of its operation over 35 years has convincingly demonstrated the historical value and lasting significance of this document for relations between the USSR and Finland and its substantial role in maintaining peace in Europe.

The treaty's provisions ensure equitable and mutually beneficial relations of good-neighborliness and trust between the USSR and Finland. The treaty is an important factor in safeguarding the security of Finland and the USSR's northwestern frontier and strengthening peace and stability in the north of Europe and on the continent as a whole.

The treaty's extension is thus a major political event not only in Soviet-Finnish relations but also on the international plane, in maintaining and strengthening the all-European process of detente. This document acquires particular significance in the conditions of the present complicated international situation.

Soviet-Finnish relations built on the basis of the Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Treaty are developing successfully in all areas to the mutual benefit of the two countries' peoples while observing the principles of equality, mutual respect, sovereignty, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

They are rightly called an example of the implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

The treaty's extension, the speaker emphasized, will undoubtedly give still greater stability to relations between the USSR and its northwestern neighbor, which occupy a special place in the Soviet state's policy, will expand the long-term prospects for Soviet-Finnish cooperation, and will give the treaty new impetus.

Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has called the extension of the treaty between the USSR and Finland a major action deepening cooperation between our countries and yet another bright page in the annals of Soviet-Finnish relations, emphasizing that it clearly indicates our states' determination to continue to pursue the tested course of friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation.

The policy of good-neighborliness, trust, and cooperation with the Soviet Union in the postwar decades has met with firm support from the overwhelming majority of the Finnish people.

Discussion then began.

L.M. Zaykov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom, said in his speech that Soviet-Finnish relations are distinguished by a high level of multifaceted cooperation. The two countries are demonstrating their ability to conduct joint affairs on the basis of mutual benefit and equitable partnership.

"The Soviet-Finnish treaty," Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, said, "is one of the most notable postwar international documents. The pledges to render mutual assistance in the event of Finland or -- via Finnish territory -- the Soviet Union becoming the target of military aggression are an integral part of the treaty."

G.A. Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and PRAVDA political observer, emphasized that the treaty is the solid foundation on which relations between our two countries are built, and that it is no accident that it is now being called the Friendship Charter. Each of its articles retains its vitality, and the two sides who concluded it are now extending the term of this truly historic document for the third time.

V.M. Line, artiste of the Latvian SSR A. Upita State Academy Theater of Drama, and I.P. Shamyakin, writer and chief editor of the "Belorussian Soviet Encyclopaedia" spoke at the session of the fruitfulness of the cultural ties between the USSR and Finland. They emphasized that these ties serve the interests of Soviet-Finnish friendship and enrich both peoples' spiritual life. They are more extensive than similar contacts with any other capitalist country.

All the speakers proposed that the protocol should be approved and recommended that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ratify it.

In concluding the discussion, B.N. Ponomarev recalled the words of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who said that "this treaty has for 35 years now well served the development of good-neighborly relations between our countries and has substantially furthered peace in the north of Europe and on the European Continent as a whole."

"The development of postwar relations between the USSR and Finland," B.N. Ponomarev observed, "is graphic evidence of the vitality and insuperability of the Leninist foreign policy of our party and the Soviet state.

Our two countries have been able to move from a period of protracted mutual distrust and alienation to stable good-neighborly relations based on friendship, mutual respect, and mutual trust. This required great efforts by state leaders and the peoples of the two countries. The treaty which is being extended today is also a reliable international legal basis for these relations. By extending the term of the treaty the two sides have confirmed their firm intention to safeguard it and develop Soviet-Finnish relations on its solid basis.

"In signing the protocol to extend the term of the 1948 treaty, the Soviet Union and Finland have again noted the great significance of Finland's foreign policy course, called the 'Paasikivi-Kekkonen line' in that country. Finnish President Koivisto has emphasized in this connection that Finland will purposefully and unfailingly pursue this line in which, according to the president, the maintenance and comprehensive development of friendly relations with the Soviet Union occupy a central place. The Soviet side too has repeatedly emphasized that this foreign policy course of Finland's is highly esteemed in the USSR and that the development and strengthening of good-neighborly relations with Finland on the basis of the 1948 treaty will continue to occupy a special place in our state's policy.

"It is characteristic that this is the third time now that the 1948 treaty is being extended without any changes, which indicates the vitality and topicality of all its provisions and principles. This treaty has been and remains a firm basis for developing fruitful ties and multilevel political, trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation between both countries for a period reaching into the next century.

"The treaty is acquiring particular significance today in the conditions of a sharp aggravation of international tension caused by the actions of U.S. imperialist circles and their NATO allies as it plays an important role in ensuring the security of Finland and the Soviet Union's northwestern borders and maintaining stability in the north of Europe.

"The extension of the Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Treaty between the USSR and Finland for the next 20 years, B.N. Ponomarev emphasized, will undoubtedly be a further important practical step in implementing the line of our party and state of strengthening universal peace, international security, and mutually beneficial cooperation with all states which display an interest in and readiness for such cooperation, irrespective of their size and social system. This treaty fully corresponds to the interests of our countries' peoples and the aims and principles of the UN Charter and is not directed against any third countries whatsoever. The decision to extend its term again has met with approval on the part of the public of both our states and of all those who are interested in strengthening peace and friendship among the peoples."

A decision was unanimously taken at the session to approve the protocol submitted and to recommend to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium that it be ratified.

KOHL, THATCHER 'CLOSE' GRENADA ISSUE

LD091321 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT 9 Nov 83

[Text] London November 9 TASS -- West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who was staying in Bonn on a visit, "have decided that U.S. intervention in Grenada should be seen as a closed issue in the interests of Western unity," REUTER reported from the West German capital.

This position assumed by the leaders of two leading West European NATO countries demonstrates well where so-called "Atlantic solidarity" leads those adhering to it. If a purely formal approach is taken to Washington's aggression against Grenada, London has every ground for viewing it as a direct encroachment on the integrity of the Commonwealth of Nations, which also includes Grenada. When Americans landed on that small Caribbean island, even such faithful Atlantists as Thatcher and Geoffrey Howe, foreign secretary in her government, could not pass this aggression over in silence. They were compelled, even if with by far greater restraint than the leaders of other NATO countries, to voice "disapproval" with the invasion. It can also be recalled that "Operation Grenada" was criticised also in Bonn, including by the West German foreign minister.

But several days later all indications were that Bonn and London had reversed their opinion. Pressing for the implementation of the U.S. and NATO plans concerning nuclear missiles, Kohl and Thatcher went back on their words, abandoning the earlier posture that was set forth by highly placed officials both in West Germany and Britain. What caused this inconsistency? It was a kind of "reprimand" from U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Dam who visited Bonn. He said bluntly that he was disappointed by West European reaction to U.S. actions in Grenada. The results of his "disappointment" were quick to show: Kohl and Thatcher "closed the issue."

The natural question in this connection is: Do they on the Rhine and the Thames really believe that the interests of these countries, the policies of Bonn and London concerning key issues should be determined solely by Washington's opinion? The position assumed by the West German and British leaders gives every ground for taking the view that U.S. policy, even if it conflicts dramatically with the interests as well as the self-respect of Britons and West Germans, was and remains the main reference point for them.

KOHL'S ASIAN 'PROPAGANDIST EXERCISE' HIT

LD092258 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 9 Nov 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Much is being written in the West about the trip by FRG Chancellor Kohl, which has ended, to Japan, Indonesia, and India. We will not dwell on all aspects of his talks in the capitals of those countries, but there is one that cannot fail to be mentioned. Judging by the numerous statements by the West German guest in those countries, he arrived there in the role of a zealous agent of American nuclear missile weapons in Western Europe. But this too would probably not merit particular mention if the West German chancellor had refrained from distortions, juggling, and direct falsehoods in his evaluations of the Soviet position on this question. But he did not refrain from this. In his words, the NATO decision on missile deployment is very advantageous not only for Western Europe but also for Asia.

Kohl -- as you see -- is persistently striving for the USSR to destroy the Soviet missiles in Europe, which are subject to reduction, so that they will not be transferred to Asia. This was said when the Soviet Union long ago stated clearly and unambiguously that, with the attainment of a mutually acceptable agreement, it is prepared to destroy all its missiles which are being reduced, deployed in the European part of our country, and that not one of those missiles would be transferred beyond the Urals.

Th · Americans, the chancellor continued in New Delhi, have presented good proposals, but unfortunately there has so far been not one reply to those proposals on the part of the Soviet Union. Now, comrades, this does not accord with reality either.

If the American zero option and its variants are to Kohl's liking, that is of course his own business. But how can one say that there has been not one reply on the part of the Soviet Union when the new proposals set forth by the Soviet leader are being discussed throughout the world and are being perceived as realistic, flexible, and constructive, reflecting the goodwill of our country?

In conclusion, let us note that the propagandist exercise by the Bonn chancellor did not have particular success in the Asian capitals. According to the influential Indian paper HINDU, the Indian Government stated directly to its guest that the proposals by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, present precisely a reasonable basis for the continuation of talks. India came out firmly in favor of the continuation of the Geneva talks without the deployment of American missiles.

ANTIMISSILE PROTEST HELD IN GREEK CITY

LD091008 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 9 Nov 83

[Text] Athens November 9 TASS -- "No to 'Pershing-2' and cruise missiles!" and "No to the arms race!" were the slogans under which a mass demonstration has taken place in the port of Piraievs, the largest Greek city, in protest against deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe.

Yannis Papaspirou, the mayor of Piraievs, representatives of trade unions and other public organizations who spoke at the meeting called for stepping up struggle for peace and for making the Balkans a zone free from nuclear weapons.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: U.S. PICKS SYRIAN TARGETS

PM131434 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Oct 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Aggression in Preparation']

[Text] New York, 12 Nov -- As the NEW YORK POST reports, "the United States is ready to hit the Syrians." While in Japan, the newspaper writes, citing informed circles, President Reagan discussed this plan in "a series of emergency consultations with congressional leaders over untappable telephone lines." Thus, even while in the Far East the head of the White House is preparing armed aggression in the Near East. As the NEW YORK POST writes, the Pentagon has already mapped out three targets for a strike, including positions of the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peacekeeping force in Lebanon. "There have been reports," it continues, "that a U.S. Marine unit equipped with electronic devices for guiding aircraft to targets has been secretly landed in the Ash-Shuf Mountains." The operation will be "carried out from the air or the sea," the newspaper notes. For its part, THE NEW YORK TIMES draws attention to the start of constant night flights by American fighters in the Beirut area. U.S. officials -- from the President to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- are demonstratively refusing to rule out the possibility of military action, and Pentagon officials admit the existence of plans for carrying out such action, another American newspaper, NEWSDAY, writes.

TASS: U.S. PLANNING PROVOCATIONS AGAINST SYRIA

LD101826 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1322 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] New York, 10 Nov (TASS) -- The Reagan administration is planning a further expansion of aggression against Lebanon and provocation against Syria. There are reports in the U.S. press about this. The warships, which have been concentrated off the Lebanese coast, THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses, are the biggest U.S. naval concentration in that region since they were first sent there. The paper points out that this gives the United States "overwhelming superiority in air power and fire power." The NEW YORK TIMES says that the U.S. command may decide either to strike using carrier-based planes or to carry out an "aggressive infantry action."

THE BOSTON GLOBE says that "the Pentagon has prepared a number of plans for military strikes against Syrian or other forces in Lebanon." According to the paper, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are discussing a broad range of options ranging "from small-scale raids by special strike groups or large-scale attacks from the air."

THE NEW YORK POST writes that "the powerful U.S. flotilla off the shores of Lebanon, which includes 30 warships and 300 planes, is only waiting for the order from Washington." The paper points out that a number of high-ranking administration representatives are insisting that mighty blows at targets on Lebanese territory be inflicted in the very near future.

SANA CITED ON SYRIAN FIRE AGAINST U.S. PLANES

LD101154 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] Damascus November 10 TASS -- U.S. F-14 warplanes based on aircraft carriers off Lebanese shores today flew a provocative sortie over positions of the Syrian contingent of the pan-Arab peacekeeping force in Lebanon. SANA news agency reported quoting a Syrian military spokesman that Syrian anti-aircraft defence forces had opened fire on those planes and driven them away towards the sea.

TASS: U.S. ENVOY TALKS IN S. AFRICA ABOUT NAMIBIA

LD101452 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] Lusaka November 10 TASS -- The aim of talks in Pretoria between Roelof Botha, foreign minister of the apartheid state, and Frank Wisner, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of state for African affairs, was to coordinate U.S. and South African expansion in southern Africa even more closely.

The U.S. envoy actually confirmed at a press conference the Reagan administration's intention to continue sabotaging the settlement of the Namibian problem, by artifically "linking" it with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. The United States, he said, insisted on the withdrawal of the Cuban contingent from Angola as a precondition for granting independence to Namibia and was not going to drop this demand. Wisner admitted that it was Washington that had invented the "linkage" thesis which, as is known, is fundamentally at variance with the U.N. decisions on Namibia and serves as a pretext for gross interference in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of Angola.

According to Western and South African press reports, the talks were devoted to strengthening the military and political alliance between the United States and racist-ruled South Africa in the framework of the Reagan-proclaimed policy of "constructive engagement" with the apartheid regime. In particular, they reviewed the fulfillment of a secret agreement between the United States, South Africa and Israel on the testing of U.S. cruise missiles and their deployment in South African territory. They also discussed ways of further escalating direct U.S. interference in the affairs of the region and joint military and political provocations against "frontline" states.

Speaking after the meeting, Botha stressed the identity of the sides' positions and made it clear that South African actions against neighboring countries had again won the approval of Washington.

CAPE VERDE PARTY DELEGATION VISITS 30 OCT-6 NOV

PM091507 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation Visit"]

[Text] A delegation of party workers from the African Party for the Independence of Cape Verde [PAICV] was in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee 30 October through 6 November.

The delegation was received at the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work and International Sections, and at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and had meetings with party workers and working people from industrial and agricultural enterprises.

The guests stressed the great importance of the CPSU's experience in socialist building for the progressive states of Africa, and confirmed the PAICV's solidarity with the peace-loving foreign policy line of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

BODYUL SEES OFF GUINEAN PREMIER BEAVOGUI

PM100853 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Moscow Stopover"]

[Text] L. Beavogui, member of the Democratic Party of Guinean Central Committee Politburo and prime minister of the People's Revolutionary Republic of Guinea, left for home 5 November, having stopped over in Moscow. He was seen off at the airport by I.I. Bodyul, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials and also by Guinean Ambassador to the USSR D. Kante.

USTINOV CITES ANDROPOV ON U.S., NATO WAR THREAT

PM111909 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "For High Combat Readiness General Political Day of the USSR Defense Ministry's Central Apparatus"]

[Text] On 11 November the Central Academy Theater of the Soviet Army hosted a general political day for generals, admirals, and officers of the USSR Defense Ministry's central apparatus, the Moscow Military District, and the Moscow Air Defense District. A report on the theme "The Tasks of the Armed Forces Arising from the Statement by Yu.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium" was delivered by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR defense minister. He conveyed to the participants in the general political day a combat greeting and best wishes for their work from Comrade Yu.V. Andropov.

Our country, together with all progressive mankind, D.F. Ustinov said, has just celebrated its greatest holiday -- the 66th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It met this holiday in the prime of its might and full of creative energy.

The country of Great October acts in the international arena as the unfailing and unwavering standard-bearer of peace. Its consistent adherence to the cause of peace and the peoples' security was confirmed with new force in the statement by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. This document of enormous political significance profoundly and comprehensively expresses the main goal of the foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state -- the prevention of nuclear war and the strengthening of universal peace. The statement provides a class-based analysis of the prevailing world situation, along with a principled evaluation of the militarist course of the incumbent U.S. Administration. "To put it briefly," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov points out, "this militarist course poses a grave threat to peace. It amounts essentially to ignoring the interests of other states and peoples and thus attempting to secure for the United States a dominating position in the world."

The aggressive policy of the United States and its NATO allies is spearheaded primarily against the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community, and against all progressive forces on earth. And this policy is so open that neither the United States nor the West European NATO countries conceal it.

The patently aggressive goals of the broad-scale war preparations by the United States and NATO are corroborated by a whole set of circumstances.

First, the "crusade" against communism and against the USSR and the other socialist community countries declared by U.S. President Reagan 18 months ago has become not merely a slogan but the program of the foreign political activity of the United States and NATO. Its main thrust is clearly defined: It consists of taking all measures to ensure the readiness to "destroy socialism as a sociopolitical system." And the practical actions of the U.S. political and military leaders are now guided by this adventurist policy. The leaders of the other NATO countries are also geared to the achievement of the goal set by this policy. This goal finds expression in all the measures of an economic, political, ideological, and military nature being undertaken by the United States and NATO. The ultrareactionary forces of imperialism have moved on from [making] appeals and slogans to their practical implementation.

Second, the United States and its NATO allies are endeavoring with the persistence of the possessed to shatter the prevailing military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. They are creating new nuclear weapons systems both of a strategic and a medium-range specification, which are perceived as the means for a first, "disarming" strike. These primarily include the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, the first and second versions of the Trident sea-based systems, the B1-B and Stealth strategic bombers, and ground-launched, air-launched, and sea-launched long-range cruise missiles. The American Pershing-II ballistic missiles and cruise missiles being deployed in Europe are also designed for the achievement of superiority over, and for a first nuclear strike against, the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

The United States and NATO are modernizing their conventional armaments and general-purpose forces on an unprecedented scale and at an unprecedented rate. Plans for the militarization of space are being formulated.

The United States and NATO are increasing appropriations for war preparations at a high rate. The United States is planning to take these appropriations to $322.5 billion in 1985. This represents a 100-150-percent increase over U.S. military expenditures of 3-4 years ago.

Certain NATO allies of the United States are participating no less zealously in the war preparations against the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community.

Third, in order to give themselves a free hand in the buildup of war preparations, the U.S. Administration and the leadership of the other NATO countries are maneuvering in every way in an attempt to evade honest negotiations on the cessation of the arms race and on arms limitation. Since the advent to power of the incumbent U.S. Administration all negotiations on these most important issues have been halted or deadlocked through its fault. Moreover, the United States came to the talks on the reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe with a patent display of reluctance and only under the pressure of the USSR's initiatives and the world public. These talks are being exploited by the U.S. ruling circles to deceive the peoples and as a false demonstration of the fact that the United States allegedly also wants arms reductions.

The so-called flexibility of the United States at the talks is also worthless. In actual fact it amounts to just one thing -- juggling with figures: how many USSR missiles to reduce and what number of American missiles to deploy in Europe.

Fourth, simultaneously with the arms buildup the United States and NATO are increasing the scale of their military exercises from year to year. They are carried out over a vast expanse: from the Arctic Ocean to the Mediterranean, from deep inside U.S. territories to the borders of the socialist community countries. Hundreds of thousands of people and a large quantity of military hardware are involved in them.

Fifth, the United States is increasingly drawing other countries in different regions of the world into the orbit of war preparations; it is implanting reactionary regimes with a view to the brutal suppression of anti-imperialist and national liberation movements. The U.S. Administration is making active efforts to revive Japanese militarism and harness it to NATO's military-political machine.

The United States is preparing its Armed Forces with the intention that they be capable of immediate action anywhere on the globe. The bandit-like attack on Grenada demonstrated to the world with an overt threat that it is prepared to employ its armed forces wherever it chooses.

For the sake of the achievement of its imperial goals, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov emphasized in his statement, the U.S. Administration "is going so far that one can only doubt the existence of any restraints at all on Washington to stop it from crossing the mark before which any thinking person must stop."

Sixth, the United States and NATO has launched a massive "psychological" attack against the USSR and the countries of the socialist community. Its aim is: the preparation of an extensive public opinion regarding the alleged inevitability of combating socialism and communism using military means; and the deception of the peoples and the concealment from them of imperialist reaction's true aspiration to world dominance. Hence the most misanthropic slander and lies, to the extent of foul invective against the socialist countries. Hence too the acts of extensive ideological subversion, blackmail, incitement, and provocation against the states of the socialist community. Hence the brazen attempts to accuse the Soviet Union and the other countries of socialism of exacerbating the international situation, increasing tension, and creating crisis situations.

The Soviet Union, D.F. Ustinov stressed, has repeatedly warned the United States and NATO that the buildup of war preparations, and especially the implementation of their plans to deploy missiles in Europe, will entail an extremely dangerous development of the situation, and that the USSR and the other socialist countries cannot remain indifferent to this. However, the leaders of the NATO bloc have in no way reacted to these warnings.

The West strives to distort all the USSR's peace-loving steps and initiatives on arms reduction, and to present them as alleged "propaganda tricks." At the same time the United States and NATO direct their efforts not toward reducing but toward exacerbating the tension that has arisen through their fault; not toward halting the arms race but toward intensifying it; not toward strengthening peace but toward a buildup in preparations for war.

In the situation that has arisen, and faced with the growing danger, the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are firmly and consistently battling to maintain and strengthen peace. At the same time they are taking additional retaliatory steps and are doing everything necessary to ensure the reliable security of our country and its allies. If the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles are installed in Europe, then our moratorium on the deployment of analogous medium-range means in the European zone of the USSR will be lifted. And we will begin additional deployment of these means. "...Risking its own security and the security of its allies," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov stressed in his recent replies to questions from PRAVDA, "is something that the Soviet Union clearly cannot and will not do."

By agreement with the GDR and Czechoslovak Governments, preparatory work has already begun on their territories for the deployment of tactical missile complexes. We will be forced to take other effective steps as well, including ones that will graphically demonstrate the illusory nature of U.S. calculations on its geographical isolation and the invulnerability of its own territory.

Measures are being implemented which are aimed at increasing the Soviet Armed Forces' combat readiness.

The Soviet people can be confident that no enemy intrigues will catch us unawares. Our Armed Forces are capable of giving a crushing rebuff to any aggression from whatever quarter. Soviet people's peaceful labor is defended, and defended reliably.

Proceeding from the situation that has arisen, the USSR minister of defense has set the Armed Forces the tasks of maintaining high vigilance, improving their training and combat readiness, further improving the troops' and naval forces technical equipment, mastering new hardware and weapons, further development military art, and introducing everything new and advanced into the training process.

In the new training year, he said, our basic efforts must be aimed at strict fulfillment of the demands of the party Central Committee and the Soviet Government, and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's directions for further increasing the Armed Forces' readiness to repel aggression and rout an adversary under whatever conditions it might unleash and wage a war. The successful resolution of this task demands a great exertion of effort and energy and the manifestation of high creativity. We cannot work in the old way or allow our movement to be dictated only by our momentum [rabotat po starinke, dvigatsya po inertsii my ne mozhem].

The best fulfillment of the tasks of combat training is promoted by party political work in the Armed Forces. Its main task is to further step up efforts to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress, the directives of the November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's directions to further increase the Armed Forces' combat readiness. It is important to ensure high ideological tempering, the readiness of all personnel to defend the motherland, and a profound understanding of the exceptional complexity of the contemporary military-political situation and of the increased danger of imperialism's unleashing a new world war. We must actively and persistently foster high vigilance and mobilize all servicemen both to increase combat readiness and the combat training of each subunit, unit, and ship, and to strengthen military discipline.

Ideological and mass political work requires constant improvement. It must be pursued in accordance with the directives of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and other party decisions. Everybody must well realize that ideological work is not just a job for professionals -- the ideologists and propagandists. It is the job of the whole party and every communist, irrespective of his post. And, naturally, it is primarily the duty of all communists in the Army and Navy's leadership element -- the central apparatus of the Defense Ministry.

In the Armed Forces, as throughout our country, party report and election meetings are currently under way. At these meetings communists are expressing critical remarks and submitting valuable proposals. These must be summarized and analyzed in the most attentive and thorough way, steps taken so that all critical remarks are heeded and proposals implemented.

Army and Navy servicemen, the USSR defense minister said in conclusion, ardently support the ideas and conclusions set out in the statement and other utterances by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov. They have adopted them for unswerving guidance, and through their practical deeds they are strengthening the country's defense capability and heightening the Soviet Armed Forces' combat readiness.

The participants in the general political day adopted with great enthusiasm a greeting letter to the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in which they gave the assurance that they will continue to devote all their knowledge, efforts, and energy to increasing vigilance and strengthening the combat might and combat readiness of the USSR Armed Forces.

ANDROPOV'S ACHIEVEMENTS IN FIRST YEAR REVIEWED

FM101444 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 7 Nov 83 p 4

[Roy Medvedev article: "Iron Gloves in the Soviet Union"]

[Text] In political life epochs do not coincide with the seasons of the calendar. Exactly a year has passed since Yuriy Andropov took over the leadership in the Kremlin. Since then much has changed, both in the country and in the Kremlin. But the possibility cannot be ruled out that even more important changes will take place in the next 2 or 3 months. However, let us follow journalistic tradition and talk about only the last 12 months.

The Soviet economy has made progress, but rather in the matter of a giant icebreaker that is forced the whole time to push new obstacles out of the way. During the Brezhnev years people had lost hope. The economy had become hollow, the administration was increasingly bureaucratic. On the bridge was a person who was not only old, powerless, and indecisive, but also morally and intellectually weak.

State and party mechanisms in the Soviet Union rule out the possibility that new or unknown people can turn up in power when they have not earlier held high-ranking posts in the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, or the Politburo. Nonetheless, the election of Yuriy Andropov as general secretary and later as president took many people by surprise and led to great interest in the new Soviet leader's personality.

The majority of Soviet people, including intellectuals, met Andropov's elevation with approval. Although for 15 years Andropov had been head of the KGB, an important but far from popular organization among the Soviet people, he was never considered to be a professional "Chekist."

He remained a professional politician and was reputed to be "intellectual" if not "liberal." The past misgovernment disorder and corruption that had so irritated people meant that they dreamed of a firm hand to lead the country out of the crisis and halt the process of moral decay which was already far advanced within the party and government apparatus.

As party leader and head of state, Andropov immediately demonstrated certainty and self-control, which Brezhnev did not do when he came to power at the beginning of the sixties. It seemed as if Andropov had long been preparing himself for his new role. It is true that his first words and actions caused concern and even fear among the significant group of people who had been promoted merely because of their connections with Brezhnev. But Andropov's confidence rating among society as a whole went up as a result of the measures he implemented.

The new leader's approach was different from his predecessor's in a remarkable way.

Andropov refrained from delivering speeches often and at great length, he limited the size of his personal secretariat, and his first demand on the party apparatus was for discipline and order. This demand soon grew into a movement embracing all enterprises and institutions in the country.

Despite the fact that the campaign meant that the police undertook mass checks in stores and movie theaters, which led to dissatisfaction and was swiftly stopped, the majority of the population supported the general trend toward reinforcing responsibility, order, and discipline at all levels of society.

The struggle for discipline was described by all the mass media and was the main theme of party propaganda during 1983. The first fight against corruption was also very actively pursued, but there was no mention of this either in the press or in propaganda, presumably because there were fears of weakening the party leadership's already undermined authority.

Early in 1983 the authorities attacked a series of despicable figures who had crudely and openly broken elementary laws. First among them was Brezhnev's close friend, Nikolay Shchelokov, the Soviet Union's interior minister, that is, a man who should have been the guardian of law and order. Shchelokov was dismissed, accused of misusing his position, and held under virtual house arrest.

Many people in responsible positions in the militia were arrested. The first secretary of the Krasnodar party organization, S.F. Medunov, another close friend of Brezhnev, lost all his posts. A trial against Medunov began and many of his colleagues were arrested.

All these were sufficiently clear warnings to certain other ministers and party secretaries. During 1983 the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB, which had been allocated additional personnel, arrested many black marketeers, thieves, embezzlers of public money, and bribe-takers, as well as some directors of large restaurants, food stores, and department stores, all of whom were charged with misuse of their position.

Some of this circle of "underground millionaires" committed suicide, others have gone into hiding. In recent months there has been a "voluntary" return to the state of the luxurious and palatial homes and country retreats that were built for many people in the government and party apparatus during Brezhnev's time.

All these changes are well known to most people, and mean that Andropov is able to retain his confidence rating.

But the fight against corruption is not only difficult, it is also dangerous. Here you create "dissidents" and "dissenters" of a new type who, unlike those who are politically motivated, will not turn to the U.S. Congress, to the correspondents of the Western press, or to the Eurocommunists.

If opinion polls were carried out in the Soviet Union they would show that Andropov's popularity was greater in November 1983 than in December 1982. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union's crisis has not been solved.

You could compare the situation in our country with a large polluted lake where a recently built purification plant has succeeded in slowing the pace of pollution, but not in stopping it,

To solve the Soviet Union's problems would take a revolution [omvaelvning] as comprehensive as that in 1921 (when the New Economic Policy, the NEP, was introduced) or of that in 1956 (when de-Stalinization became official policy). To get the Soviet Union in some sort of order its course would need to be changed by 15-20 degrees. So far the change has been only 2-3 degrees. There is still time to correct the course -- but time is running out.

What is it then that obstructs more far-reaching changes?

The Soviet economy and society are more complicated now then when earlier revolutions took place. There are also differences between different regions. The country's disease is chronic -- and society has adapted itself to it.

Cures that are too brusque would be too risky. Even Khrushchev attempted to break the bureaucratic system, but he not only failed, he even managed to ensure that the system was consolidated.

So there has been no revolution in the Soviet Union in the last 12 months. But there have been changes.

These chiefly affect the economy, where small improvements can be noted. For example, a start has been made on the manipulation of state prices; the prices of certain products in demand (including vodka, a popular measure) have been reduced, and the prices of others, including the majority of agricultural products, have been increased. Cooperative-commercial trade, which maintains higher prices than the state prices, has been promoted.

Many of the measures give reason to believe that a new staff of advisers has begun to grow around Andropov, a sort of brain trust.

Only one of Brezhnev's advisers has remained with Andropov -- Andrey Aleksandrov. A man who has retained his influence and has even strengthened it is United States and Canada Institute Director Georgiy Arbatov.

Unlike domestic policy, foreign policy has not undergone any tangible changes. The Soviet Union's international position has been the object of constant attention and become a theme in the new leader's public appearances. Not much has happened in Afghanistan or in Poland. Slowly, but consistently, rapprochement between the Soviet Union and China has proceeded.

The Soviet leadership has followed developments in the world's "hot spots" attentively: the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, southern Africa, Central America, and Southeast Asia. Our press has followed developments in the FRG and other parts of Europe, as it has the economic situation in the industrialized and the developing countries respectively.

However, the greatest interest has been devoted to the U.S. medium-range missiles that are due for deployment in some Western countries, chiefly the FRG, in December 1983. But we do not know the details of the intensive Geneva negotiations on this subject.

Since the end of 1982 the Soviet Union has put forward a series of compromise proposals which point to a softening of its attitude. As yet these proposals have not been accepted. On a number of points the United States has also demonstrated a softer attitude, but the President's proposals have been rejected as inadequate.

A movement against nuclear arms and against the European arms race in particular has grown up in the West. It is clear that the Soviet Union has great expectations of this movement.

In the next 2 or 3 months the attempts to find a solution to these problems will be in the foreground. The Soviet Union has already warned of a number of possible counter-measures. Further measures could be even more serious, even though the pressure on the Western nations and in the FRG in particular could be combined with a number of new concessions.

Contrary to what a number of Western experts believe, the Soviet Union does not want to begin a new, dangerous, and costly acceleration of the arms race. For despite all the economic disorder in our country it has insufficient [as published] potential ever to allow the West again to gain the upper hand in the nuclear arms field.

Undoubtedly the tragedy that unfolded on the night of 1 September over the Sea of Japan has seriously damaged the reputation of the Soviet Union. But it is impossible to accept the view of some Western experts that the destruction of the Boeing jet was a conscious action by the Soviet Union.

It is also difficult to believe the Soviet propaganda version, which claims that the CIA consciously sentenced the 269 people on board the Korean aircraft to death to help Reagan steer the biggest military budget in history through Congress.

South Korea, Japan, the United States, and the Soviet Union carry the responsibility for what happened. Some important details of the tragedy are still unknown, and perhaps we will never know some of them. That night the Soviet Air Forces made a series of mistakes, but the most unforgiveable thing was that for 5 days the Soviet Union disclaimed all responsibility for the downing of the Boeing aircraft, which the Air Forces believed the whole time to be a U.S. spy plane.

In politics it is difficult to always tell the truth. But today many people are asking themselves the justified question: Can one believe in politicians who in such an important and tragic situation say one thing and do another?

The political damage has been only partially alleviated by the subsequent explanations. However, what is important is that the tragedy over the Sea of Japan did not lead to the breaking off of the Madrid conference. This shows the good effects of the Helsinki agreement. However, the propaganda noise surrounding the downing of the jet meant that the conference passed almost unnoticed.

A new politician needs new people. It would be superfluous to point out that Brezhnev's administration or "gang," which defended cadre stability, has not only aged physically but has also outlived itself politically and morally. In the last 10 or 12 years nepotism, ingratiation, and personal ties have played a more important tole than personal qualities, talent, and knowledge.

Andropov has called on the party to put an end to such habits. This was shown most clearly at the Politburo's meeting with veterans in August 1983. When one of the veterans demanded that tough measures be used against "those who do not think of the common good or of work, but only of their own welfare," Andropov interrupted the speaker with the ambiguous reply: "We promise you that."

In the last year hard blows have rained down on the people in "Brezhnev's gang." Shchelokov and Medunov has lost their posts and been put on trial. G.S. Pavlov and S.P. Trapeznikov have been removed from the Central Committee. Brezhnev's most influential adviser, G.E. Tsukanov, has had to retire, like Deputy Prime Minister I.T. Novikov. All these were friends of Brezhnev back in his student days or in his years in Moldavia or the Ukraine.

The leadership has also been replaced in a number of ministries, in the Central Committee, and in local party bodies. People who played almost no role during the Brezhnev era have been advanced into important posts -- V.I. Vorotnikov and Ye.K. Ligachev, for example. But so far the changes have affected only 5-6 percent of the leading group. As a rule, those who are now retiring aged 70 to 75 are being succeeded by people aged between 60 and 65.

There is a desire to accelerate the renewal of the leadership. The very tough Central Committee decision on elections and accountability in all party organizations bears witness to this. We can assume that 30-40 percent of first secretaries will be replaced. In the spring of 1984 there will be elections to the Supreme Soviet, and as a result a new Council of Ministers will have to be selected. But we can talk about this when we analyze the new party leadership's second year.

The areas where fewest changes have taken place are those of culture and ideology. The most important change is what we could call Leonid Brezhnev's "political death." There is nothing left in newspaper propaganda or in the consciousness of the people about this "great" politician, author, army leader, theoretician, and so on.

But in many other ways the situation in culture has become much worse: theater, film, literature have moved backwards. Censorship has become tougher, the channels of information are even fewer.

The country's ideological life is limited to a series of jubilees. The Soviet Union celebrates its 60th anniversary, then comes the 40th anniversary of the battles of Stalingrad and Kursk, the 100th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx. But the jubilees pass and leave no trace in the consciousness of the people.

A not insignificant role in this is probably played by the fact that there have been no personnel changes in the field of ideology. Konstantin Chernenko remains secretary for ideological questions in the Central Committee and Petr Demichev is still culture minister.

The most important ideological idea was voiced by Andropov himself at the meeting with veterans. He noted very rightly that the party cannot attract people simply with words, but that it is necessary to show "concern for ideological work. For disorder, mismanagement, cupidity, bribes, and violations of the law destroy the work carried out by thousands of agitators and propagandists" (PRAVDA, 16 August 1983).

It is important that these not remain mere words.

Nor is the last year enhanced by the fight against dissidents which has been "carried out conclusively." It could simply be said that the opposition movement which was born in the sixties and which was still very active in 1976-77 ceased to be an important social movement and power factor in the Soviet Union's domestic life back in the Brezhnev era. A few solidarity dissidents will continue their activities, but they cannot influence the atmosphere in society, which is now different from the atmosphere in the mid-sixties. In the light of this the extremely tough sentences passed on individual opposition figures during 1983 seem peculiar, to say the least.

If there are to be any more changes they will take place in the next few years. We can also expect the ordinary party congress to be brought forward by 1 year or 18 months. But in these years there will also be major changes in the West. The next 2 years will be decisive for the fate of the world in the next 20-25 years. Not only heads of state and party leaders, but also ordinary people should contribute to the solution of the world's problems.

GRISHIN VISITS MOSCOW CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

PM131850 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 83 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Familiarization With New Construction Projects"]

[Text] Yesterday V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, visited projects commissioned by the city's construction workers on the eve of the 66th anniversary of Great October. He visited a section of the third city transport ring and toured an underground tunnel on this section of the main line. V.V. Grishin also visited the new Moskovskiy store -- the largest department store in the country.

ACADEMIC URGES CHANGES IN COURT PROCEDURES

PM101403 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Nov 83 p 14

[Article by Prof V. Savitskiy, chief of the theoretical problems sector of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, doctor of legal sciences, under the "Continuation of a Theme" rubric: "For the Sake of Truth..."]

[Text] How many times have I had occasion to witness the following scene: A lawyer walks -- no, forces his way! -- into the courtroom through a crowd of grief-stricken relatives. Their eyes show not just the pain of loss but also hatred toward the person now sitting in the dock. But he, the lawyer, will defend him -- it is incumbent on him! You would hardly want to be in his shoes. A very weighty obligation! For many people the fulfillment of this obligation would be contrary to our concepts of honor, conscience, and moral duty...almost an obstacle to justice.

Here is what a USSR Supreme Court guideline has to say on this matter: "The defense lawyer, in assisting the accused in the execution of his legal rights, thereby promotes the correct and comprehensive examination of the case and the passing of a legal, valid, and just sentence."

Why has it suddenly become necessary to recall these evident truths? N. Loginova's polemical article "Retrial" (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 39, 1983) casts doubt, it seems to me, on the place and role of the lawyer in the legal process. It is true that at the end of the article she says that the defense lawyer's mission is noble and humane. But overall the article is about a defense lawyer in a specific trial who did not behave in the best possible way.

In my view the author is wrong to assert that the "retrial" only occurred because the lawyer did not show simple respect to the plaintiffs. Were it so easy to change a verdict (if one participant in a trial "respects" another that is good, if not it is bad) justice would be turned into something diffuse and amorphous, deprived of objective criteria. In fact the sentence was quashed because the plaintiffs considered the punishment imposed on the accused too mild and higher court agreed with their conclusions. As a result of the "retrial" the punishment was increased. But the author of the polemical remarks tries all the time to convince the reader that the plaintiffs, in making their complaint, were guided solely by resentment toward the lawyer. But for this resentment, she asserts, there would have been no complaint or "retrial."

What disrespect did N. Loginova see in the lawyer's conduct? I shall not describe the plaintiffs' letter that she cites: One can forgive emotion in the victims of misfortune, but even then it is unpardonable to write that the lawyer (an official carrying out professional obligations) is a "loudmouthed lady with a sharp, unpleasant voice who behaves like a bad provincial actress."

The author of the article "Retrial" was only present at the second hearing, but even there, in her opinion, the lawyer (the same woman) continued to behave "inadequately." This "inadequacy" took the form, apparently, of the defense lawyer's asking the plaintiffs questions that -- although lawful -- were expressed with "malice in her voice." The aforementioned "lady" made gestures and remarks in a way insulting to the plaintiffs, and acted out a "whole pentomime...."

I am sure that each of us, if observed from the sidelines by someone who is not impartial, could be presented even more clumsily and comically still, but what did the lawyer actually say (as opposed to what she merely wanted to say)? She persistently asked one plaintiff to name the degree of punishment that the latter believed should be inflicted on the culprit. The defense lawyer asked this, of course, with "dramatic overemphasis" and "literally harassed" the plaintiff, and all of this "was like a circus."

Permit me to say here that the initial sentence was quashed because the plaintiffs considered it insufficient, and when the court settles the question of a new sentence how will it be possible to avoid asking the plaintiffs to give their opinion? (It is not of decisive significance for the court, of course, but is taken into account when passing sentence). Had the lawyer not done so (rudeness, of course, should not take place here) she simply would not have known what to defend and what to dispute. In other words, our "loudmouthed lady" would simply have left her client helpless and would have been in breach of her professional duty.

Of course the plaintiff would hardly have felt comfortable when undergoing interrogation. But the law prescribes no other way of eliciting her opinion. Is this right? If someone is the victim of a crime, he must be given an opportunity to speak up in court and say how he assesses the evidence investigated there and what he thinks of the accused's personality and the sentence that he deserves. But no! All the participants in a trial -- the prosecutor, the defense lawyer, and the accused -- have an opportunity to make a statement and it is only the plaintiff who is deprived of this seemingly natural and elementary right by the law as it now stands. Why? You will not find the answer anywhere -- it simply does not exist.

Every trial must be a real school of education, a lesson in moral training, and testimony to the certain victory of good over evil. We want people to believe in the dependability and strength of court protection of their honor, dignity, life, health, and property if anyone dares to encroach upon these human blessings guaranteed by the Constitution. Of course, the end result of court intervention is important, but the forms in which a trial is conducted are far from unimportant for asserting the standard of legal proceedings and legal standards generally.

For the sake of truth it has to be said that the ban on participating in pleadings places the plaintiff in an unequal position compared with the other participants in the trial. People might dispute his case and try to prove its groundlessness, but he has no right to object to his procedural adversaries. Although the law was recently amended slightly in this respect, it was not changed substantially: the plaintiff continues to be questioned like an ordinary witness and is not granted access to the court platform. I see this as a substantial shortcoming in the procedural form.

Formality, ceremony, and ritual in court are not simply a tribute to tradition or an anachronism that is preserved merely through the efforts of pettifoggers. Ritual is valuable because it teaches and educates. The experience of generations lies behind every detail prescribed by law -- whether it concerns the method of calling the counsel for the defense, the sequence for checking evidence, or the procedure for lodging a complaint. Soviet criminal procedure has taken into account and extracted for itself all the very best in the centuries-old practice of legal proceedings. The court procedure that we have adopted is a scientifically substantiated method, verified under different conditions, of discovering the truth, asserting the truth, and fostering respect for the court.

A reservation is needed here. A form of procedure fulfills its role only when backed by adequate substance. Observance of procedural forms without following the spirit of the law results in a cult of form. N. Loginova told us of a case in which the counsel for the defense, albeit less than perfectly [khudo-bedno], nevertheless fulfilled his chief function of defending the accused. But I want to speak about a case when the counsel for the defense totally forgot why he had been called into court. That is, of course, he did not forget why he had been called into court, but he behaved as though the procedural form of defense depended only on his personal judgment -- I do what I want.

It all began with the defendant rejecting the counsel appointed to him by the court, since he believed that he was insufficiently acquainted with the materials of the case. He wanted to call a different counsel for the defense -- one of his own choice. However, the court refused the defendant's legitimate request, citing the lawyer's objection to his being rejected. Can you picture the situation? The defendant does not trust his counsel and does not want him to act for him, while the counsel for the defense considers it moral for him to do so against the wish of his client.

Moreover, having refused to quit the trial, the counsel for the defense took a plainly accusatory stance. And in his speech he simply supported the charge on which the prosecutor was insisting.

Of course, the USSR Supreme Court quashed the sentence, since "the court committed a gross violation of the accused's right to defense, which is laid down in law -- which had an adverse effect on the course of the court investigation...."

Our trials are based on the principle of contention: The prosecution and the defense have equal rights to submit petitions, to offer evidence, and to participate in the investigation of it. The democratic nature of this rule is universally recognized. But annoying "trifles" frequently reduce this equality to a formality.

The court, in deciding a certain question, turns both to the prosecutor and to the counsel for the defense. If the counsel for the defense tries to justify his opinion in detail, the prosecutor will often restrict himself to a single unchallengeable sentence as if letting all present know that there is no need for him to adduce arguments -- the court will nonetheless agree with him. People see this and draw their conclusions. They also see that in his appeal to the court the prosecutor may scarcely move from his seat, while the counsel for the defense stands erect, almost as if at attention. Nor does the domineering tone in which the prosecutor talks to the accused, the witnesses, and the experts, his often abusive rejoinders especially with regard to the defendant, and his demonstrative familiarity with the judges during recess when he simply goes into the consulting room and has a smoke and so forth pass unnoticed either. All these nuances of behavior, which I would term the "power syndrome," do no honor to the prosecutor. Thus because of a low standard of general and legal etiquette the court's prestige is often undermined.

And yet, however the prosecutor and the defense counsel, the defendant, and the plaintiff conduct themselves, it is not they who set the tone in the court and it is not on them -- or more accurately not solely on them -- that the assessment -- plus or minus -- that the trial has in the eyes of the public depends.

The court's educational influence and its moral and ethical impact are determined primarily by the manner in which the court itself behaves. What does this mean in practice? Taking upon oneself the whole burden of the search for proof?

Energetically questioning the defendants and witnesses, putting additional questions to the experts, cutting short excessively loquacious plaintiffs? Or giving both sides the opportunity to conduct questioning and study the evidence themselves? Let them publicly demonstrate the weight and cogency of their arguments. The court will listen, observe, compare, and draw conclusions from both sides' arguments. And speak -- when passing judgment.

I think that the second style of trial is the most in keeping with the court's lofty mission....

If you have ever been in a courtroom your attention cannot fail to have been drawn to the fact that at the very beginning of proceedings the presiding officer reads out the indictment. This is the document in which the conclusion of the investigating officer and the prosecutor regarding the accused's guilt is formulated. But why must those present learn the state prosecutor's position not from him himself, but from the judge? Someone unacquainted with the niceties of jurisprudence might easily form the opinion that the judge reads out the charge because he agrees with it.

No, in my view, it is not the job of the judge to read out the bill of indictment. It is not his concern.... But whose is it then? Naturally, that of the prosecutor. He is the state's prosecutor, he has approved the bill of indictment, who else but the prosecutor should read it out in court? And if it is not to be the prosecutor, let it be read out by a neutral figure: the clerk of the court. A triviality? Do not say that. Many things would be put right as a result of this kind of change in procedure.

And furthermore. Who should be first to question the defendant -- the prosecutor, the defense lawyer, or the court? In most union republics the law prescribes that after a free statement by the defendant it is the judge who puts question to him first. But what does this lead to? In practice the first questioning of the defendant most often takes on an accusatory nature. The person interrogating is psychologically unable to get rid of the picture of the crime drawn in his consciousness by the bill of indictment that has just been read out. There is no need to take the extreme case where the judge forgets his own role in the proceedings and makes up his mind in advance whether the picture is truthful and accurate. But even when he regards it as just one possible version of the commission of the crime, he must take the bill of indictment as his starting point in formulating his questions. And this inevitably gives an accusatory coloring to the questioning.

Naturally, an experienced judge will be able to conduct the first questioning objectively and impartially without revealing his attitude to the charge or advertising his sympathies and antipathies. But the danger of being unintentionally prejudiced when one has to begin the questioning is a real one. A procedure whereby the defendants, witnesses, and plaintiffs are interrogated first by the prosecutor, then by other participants in the proceedings, and only after them by the court would be the most sensible procedure. Formerly this sequence of questioning was established only in the Ukraine, but it is now also being used in Georgia, Uzbekistan, and Estonia. I believe that the time has come to resolve this question in a similar way in the other republics. The standard of court proceedings can only benefit from this.

The old maxim has it that "A trial is not for blaming, but for judging." Therein the people expressed their ideal of an honest and objective trial where the most important thing is to come to a just decision. It is essential to do everything to ensure that this faith in a fair trial is not shaken by the use of rules which in even the smallest degree call into question the impartiality of those who are entrusted to decide people's fates.

SHEVARDNADZE WRITES ON GEORGIYEVSK ANNIVERSARY

PM091546 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Oct 83 First Edition p 2

[Article by E. Shevardnadze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee: "The Great Logic of Life; On the Bicentennial of the Georgiyevsk Treaty"]

[Text] A festive mood reigns in Georgia. The Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic has been awarded the Order of Lenin for the great successes achieved by the republic's working people in economic and cultural building and to mark the bicentennial of the Georgiyevsk Treaty of Friendship between Russia and Georgia. The greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers has been received by all the republic's working people with a feeling of sincere gratitude to the Communist Party and the Soviet Government and of pride at having contributed to our multinational union's great deeds and achievements.

Georgia has celebrated the important milestones in the history of the relationship of the Ukrainian, Kazakh, Azerbaijani, and Armenian peoples and our country's other peoples with the great Russian people. Now a great and radiant festival of international unity, friendship, and fraternity has come to our ancient land. The whole of the multinational family of the USSR's peoples is celebrating together with us. What are the forces that attract the country's peoples to the great Russian people? There is the international character of their soul, their humanism, and their selfless struggle for truth and justice. The Russian character is as expansive and beautiful as Russia itself. The nature of Russian people is as rich and inexhaustible as the mineral resources of the Russian land.

The Treaty of Georgiyevsk was the precursor of the progressive historical process which has brought Georgia through centuries of struggle and through the crucibles of revolutionary battles to its present socioeconomic and cultural flowering in the fraternal family of Soviet socialist republics.

"History cannot dissemble" -- those are the words of a famous son of the Georgian people, the patriot and educator Vakhushti Bagratiopi, who stood at the cradle of the Treaty of Georgiyevsk. Indeed, the logic of history is unshakable. Only common fundamental interests and aims of two peoples, not of dynasties and rulers, could form the objective historical precondition for their genuine unity and their joint struggle for mankind's bright ideals. Only an alliance with Russia could save Georgia, which was pouring out its life-blood in an unequal struggle with foreign invaders, and its courageous freedom-loving people from physical annihilation and clear the way for its economic, cultural, and spiritual rebirth.

The mutual understanding between the progressive social strata of Russia and Georgia gained a new quality when revolutionary democratic thought began to feed liberation ideals. Russia's educational establishments not only served to satisfy the young Georgian's craving for knowledge, but also became their first school of democratic education. A remarkable galaxy of Georgian "Men of the Sixties" was formed, headed by I. Chavchavadze, A. Tsereteli, and N. Nikoladze. Georgian young people eagerly absorbed the progressive ideas of V. G. Belinskiy, N. G. Chernyshevskiy and N. A. Dobrolyubov.

A decisive stage in the international rallying of the peoples was the Russian proletariat's appearance in the historical arena of the class struggle. The workers movement in Georgia developed in inseparable unity with the Russian-wide workers movement. Transcaucasian social democratic organizations were closely connected with the Petersburg "League of Struggle To Liberate the Working Class" set up by V. I. Lenin.

Lenin directed the entire activity of the party organizations of Georgia and the transcaucasian Leninist-Iskra organizations became Lenin's reliable support in the struggle to set up a genuinely proletarian party of a new type and to preserve the purity of the principles of revolutionary theory. Boundless devotion to Lenin's cause and a sense of lofty internationalism have always been characteristic of the Georgian Bolsheviks. They are remembered in many parts of Russia where the battles with tsarism were fought. The best sons of the Georgian people took an active part in the Great October Socialist Revolution and defended its gains during the terrible years of the mortal struggle by the first state of the dictatorship, of the proletariat against the forces of internal and international reaction. And when the hour came of the "final and decisive battle" against the Menshevik bourgeois-nationalist government and the foreign interventionists, Soviet Russia's working class and the Red Army, in response to a request by Georgia's working people and on V. I. Lenin's personal instructions, came to the assistance of the insurgent people.

The red banner of Great October and Soviet power which was hoisted over Tbilisi 25 February 1921 became a symbol of the realized dreams and aspirations of many generations of Georgia's working people, the beginning of a new era in its age-old history -- the era of the complete emancipation of the people's creative energy and of truly historic creativity by the masses.

Proletarian internationalism and the Leninist nationalities policy have been a powerful creative force from the first days of building the new life. The year was 1921. Soviet power in Georgia was taking its first steps, yet V. I. Lenin was already looking ahead into the country's future. His well-known letters to Caucasus communists contained essentially a detailed program for the socialist restructuring of the region's economy and culture.

This Leninist concern became the cornerstone of the party's economic policy and of socialist management and a constitutional principle in the relations between the peoples of our multinational union. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has said, "for the first time, the country's multinational composition was transformed from a source of weakness into a source of strength and prosperity."

Yes, this strength has helped the Georgian people, shoulder to shoulder with the great Russian people and in the fraternal family of all the USSR's nations and ethnic groups, to make their own worthy contribution to industrialization, collectivization, and the cultural revolution, to the defense of the socialist motherland during the years of the Great Patriotic War, and to the postwar rebirth of the country and the building of the world's first society of developed socialism.

The strength of socialist internationalism lies in the fact that it pools all that is best in the ideological, intellectual, and moral and spiritual makeup of the Soviet peoples and augments manyfold their creative potential and genius.

This natural law is manifested especially markedly during the period of developed socialism, when the nationwide economy -- the country's integrated national economic complex -- attains a qualitatively new level, when the social uniformity of society grows, and the inseparable unity of union and national statehood strengthens on the basis of the deepening of the principles of socialist democracy. Simultaneously, processes of the exchange of material and spiritual values gain in intensity, and the internationalization of the Soviet peoples' whole way of life and the transformation of their truly national assets into international assets and of international assets into national assets of the peoples of the USSR occur on the basis of the all-round blossoming, rapprochement, and mutual enrichment of the spiritual cultures of the socialist nations and ethnic groups. All this predetermined the formation of the new historical community of people -- the Soviet people. Not only de jure but also de facto equality of nations and ethnic groups has been achieved in society.

And this actual equality is ensured above all by the creation of a firm economic base in all the national regions. Soviet Georgia provides a graphic example. Literally a few days ago, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved a long-term program for the development of the Georgian SSR's power industry through the year 2000. And how can one not recall the time when the RSFSR Government, on V. I. Lenin's instructions, allocated R750,000 in gold to young Soviet Georgia for the construction of one of the first projects of GOELRO [State Commission for the Electrification of Russia] -- the Zemo-Avchalskaya GES. Decades separate these two events and the adopted decisions are on a completely different scale, but they are united by the Leninist principle: to create all the conditions for the accelerated development of production forces everywhere.

Precisely this was the aim of the fundamental resolutions adopted by the party and the government in recent years with regard to Georgia and its party organization. As a result of their unswerving implementation, the republic's economic and industrial potential has almost doubled over the past 10-11 years, purchases of the main agricultural products have increased, and the volume of assimilated capital investments has increased by more than 80 percent. About 500,000 additional people have been involved in social production. The republic has gained leading positions in the country as regards many indicators, particularly one of the most important indicators -- the labor productivity growth rate.

At the same time in these years the republic's party organization, asserting a Leninist style of work and endeavoring to improve the psychological climate everywhere, has acquired experience in concentrating efforts on the solution of the most important and urgent problems and in improving the management of economic and cultural building. The swift development of production forces, as is known, inevitably leads to changes in production relations, and management is one of the most important levers for regulating these relations. It is from this angle that the management experiments implemented in the republic must be viewed -- experiments which have absorbed all that is most progressive and best in the experience gained in the party organizations of the fraternal republics and the socialist community countries. We have developed the experiments in practice, in turn making our experience the property of the whole collective international experience.

This was precisely how the progressive method of managing the agro-industrial complex which was first tried out in the republic's Abashskiy Rayon and which, together with similar initiatives in other regions was recommended by the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum for universal introduction took shape. We are now continuing the steps to integrate agriculture with the sectors serving it so as to increase the republic's contribution to the implementation of the country's Food Program.

An interesting search for new forms of management is also being conducted in the sphere of industrial production. Thus the intersectional production association created in Poti has made it possible to improve the coordination of the activity of the city's enterprises irrespective of their departmental subordination, which has had a very tangible effect on increasing all economic indicators.

The work being done is closely linked with the system for improving the professional competence of our party, soviet, and economic cadres, broadening their economic erudition, and stepping up economic work at local level. This has made it possible to considerably deepen the search for reserves for increasing production on both the sectorial and the territorial levels and is producing considerable results.

The tasks of intensifying national economic sectors and increasing labor productivity dictate the need to concentrate efforts on the problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress and stepping up the party's influence in this sphere.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee has set communists the task of transforming the entire republic into a proving ground for the introduction of the best achievements of science, technology, and advanced experience and of modern management methods.

All our initiatives and creative quests rely on the businesslike support and interest of the party Central Committee, the Soviet Government, union ministries and departments, and many of the country's enterprises, organizations, and institutions.

The Soviet republics pool the results of their labor in the common national economic complex, and each unit of output that they produce contains within it the combined labor of the USSR's peoples.

Concern for the social progress, prosperity, and spiritual blossoming of each nation and ethnic group is our permanent party and state program. In the past few years alone, the republic's Communist Party Central Committee and government have adopted a number of resolutions aimed at the comprehensive socioeconomic and cultural development of the Abkhaz ASSR, the Adzhar ASSR, and the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast, as well as other multinational regions in Georgia. Constant attention is paid to strengthening and broadening business ties with the fraternal republics and to developing socialist competition.

A number of party-government decisions adopted in the republic have been specially devoted to practical measures to improve the teaching of national languages -- Georgian, Abkhaz, Osetian, Armenian, Azari, Kurdish, and Greek -- in Soviet Georgia's schools. At the same time special attention is paid to the study of the Russian language, to which the dissemination of revolutionary ideas and the social and cultural transformations that have taken place in our people's life are connected to a considerable extent. Measures to protect historical monuments and material culture are coordinated by party and soviet organs and specially created components. The republic's cultural life is multifaceted and international, which is promoted by the activity of many national artistic collectives, the periodicals and books published in the republic in six languages of the USSR's peoples, and the expansion of the base of multinational scientific and study centers.

We try to organically combine socioeconomic measures with mass propaganda work. The network of branches of the unique Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences Museum of the Friendship of the Peoples is being enlarged both here and outside the republic as well. The best popular traditions, mass festivals, and civic rituals have been filled with new socialist content.

Could even the most optimistic futurologist of the past have imagined that in such a historically brief period Georgia would win international prestige in the sphere of scientific thought and artistic creativity? The scientific works and artistic productions of many of the republic's scientists and literary and artistic figures represent a considerable contribution to socialist civilization's spiritual treasury. And it gives us particular pleasure that Georgia's cultural life is constantly enriched by the vivid and original works of the masters of culture of all the nations and ethnic groups living here.

Internationalism is the highest form of a nation's spiritual life, since it is on that basis that the interpenetration and mutual enrichment of the national cultures of the USSR's fraternal peoples take place. It is well known that the harmonious unity of diversity is one of the most important principles of artistic perfection. The phenomenon of polyphony whereby each voice has its own function and special tone but, merging with the others, forms a surprisingly harmonious whole is widespread in Georgian folk music. We see a similar phenomenon when we speak of the mutual enrichment of the national cultures of the country's peoples, which forms the multifaceted alloy of Soviet socialist culture.

Every true work of literature and art is of general human significance -- this is an international phenomenon. Art is an important means of uniting people. What vivid and visible confirmation of this was provided by the Georgian literature and art festivals held in this jubilee year in Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Vladimir, Stavropol, and other RSFSR cities and the recent RSFSR literature and art festival held in Georgia! These events were an important stage in the historical process of the spiritual mutual enrichment of the Russian and Georgian peoples and took the form of a festival of multinational Soviet culture.

In preparing to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Georgiyevsk Treaty we have been constantly aware of the particularly close, extraordinarily active, and somewhat unhealthy attention of bourgeois propaganda toward the approaching event. The transatlantic "protectors" of national interests have again "given tongue." What has so upset our Western "opponents," and what is the reason for their keen disquiet over the 200th anniversary of the Georgiyevsk Treaty? The answer is simple and clear: The jubilee milestone in the unification of the Russian and Georgian peoples is yet another convincing demonstration of the triumph of the CPSU's Leninist nationalities policy, socialist internationalism, and the ever-increasing international influence of the Soviet state's experience in resolving the nationalities question.

Consistent internationalism and the ideas of humanism, friendship, peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding among the peoples form the essence of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. It is this spirit and these ideas that permeate all the initiatives by the party and government aimed at preserving and consolidating peace and easing international tension, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has said with such force in a number of speeches.

Arduous historical experience demonstrates that man follows ideas which he believes to be true. The truth and vitality of Marxist-Leninist ideas have been verified by the entire history of the formation and development of our international community. Having begun to put them into practice after October 1917 and overcoming the difficulties of pioneers of the bright future and the stern trials of intervention and wars, our country's peoples have sealed the bonds of their fraternity even more strongly.

Though we approach creatively the solution of each problem in our development, we are not immune from individual shortcomings. On such occasions, as V. I. Lenin taught, the party always talks openly and publicly with people about the problems and shortcomings and consults the people on ways of overcoming them.

Lenin spoke of the Communist Party as a party of innovators. Vivid confirmation of this was provided by the decision of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums, which determined a specific, scientifically validated and realistic program for the improvement of mature socialism.

Great and complex tasks face the communists and working people of Soviet Georgia and of all the union republics on the path toward its implementation. But we are filled with a sense of historical optimism and confidence in the attainment of the projected goals since we stand alongside the great Russian people and all the peoples of our united family. As we mark the 200th anniversary of the Georgiyevsk Friendship Treaty today we can see the logical continuity and common moral basis between this noteworthy date and the great historical process of the international unification of all the peoples of the USSR.

KAPITONOV ADDRESSES 21 OCT UZBEK AKTIV MEETING

PM092054 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 22 Oct 83 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report on speech by I. V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered at the 21 October Tashkent meeting of the Uzbek SSR party and economic aktiv]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! Allow me to convey to the aktiv, and through you to Uzbekistan's communists and all working people, ardent greetings from Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and his best wishes for labor successes, prosperity, and happiness.

Our party and state firmly follow a course of improving the Soviet people's life and ensuring peaceful conditions for their constructive labor. The CPSU's entire domestic and foreign policy is imbued with concern for this.

Nowadays we live under the indelible impression of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement, which has been received with unanimous approval by the Communists and all Soviet people. All principles contained in the statement have received full and universal support. The statement has generated a new patriotic upsurge and has rallied our people even further. In response to the intrigues by the warmongers, the Soviet people express firm determination to strengthen our country's economic and defense might with their selfless labor.

The party Central Committee is engaged in vigorous work to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee's November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. Measures are being taken to transfer the economy onto the tracks of intensive development, accelerate scientific and technical progress, improve management, and comprehensively strengthen the state, plan, and labor discipline.

The country's national economy is developing steadily and progressively. Higher rates of industrial development and labor productivity growth are being maintained in 1983 in comparison with the first 2 years of the 5-year plan. Despite all the whims of the weather, there have been positive developments in agriculture, too. The gross grain harvest has surpassed last year's indicators. The procurement of livestock breeding produce is set to exceed the plan. The development of the draft plan for the USSR's economic and social development in 1984 is in the process of being completed. It is envisaged to consolidate the positive trends in the development of the national economy and ensure further improvement in its efficiency and further growth of the Soviet people's living standards. In one word, our onward progress is noticeably faster at the midpoint of the 5-year plan.

Uzbekistan is developing successfully within the fraternal family of Soviet republics, I. V. Kapitonov went on to say. We have had an opportunity to see for ourselves the tremendous deeds accomplished by the working people under the leadership of the republican party organization. Uzbekistan today is a republic with powerful industry and highly developed agriculture. The diversified industry covers more than 100 sectors and produces a wide range of items, including aircraft and most complicated instruments. The achievements in the flourishing of culture in Uzbekistan, just as in the other Soviet republics, are truly vast.

Tashkent has changed beyond all recognition. Despite its 2,000 years, it has the appearance of a young, modern city. The Soviet people have given enormous international assistance to its restoration. Today it is the center of machine building, electronic industry, and a number of other leading industrial sectors.

Uzbekistan's capital joyfully welcomes guests from all the republics. It has become the venue for international forums of writers, scientists, peace fighters, and cinematographers. The city's merits have been correctly rewarded by the highest government award -- the Order of Lenin.

The meetings and talks with people bring special satisfaction when touring the republic. You cannot fail to notice the businesslike atmosphere in the collectives and the good mood of the working people. They actively support the party's policy and the fruitful activity by the Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov.

At today's conference of the party and economic aktiv, the speaker went on, and as part of the process of monitoring the execution of previously taken decisions, discussion centers on a topical issue. The conference has invited the leaders of those organizations that are meant to ensure that the people's demand for goods is satisfied. A businesslike, specific discussion is taking place. All this corresponds with the importance of this question and the role Uzbekistan has to play in resolving it.

The Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, its bureau, and the republic's party, soviet, and economic organs pay much attention to the questions pertaining to the development of consumer goods production. A plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee examined the tasks of the republic's party, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organizations in the light of the Central Committee plenum requirements and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's instructions on increasing the output and improving the quality of goods. The state of affairs in goods production was analyzed in detail and a good resolution was adopted, measures are being taken for its implementation.

The work that is being done is yielding tangible results. In comparison with 1975, the volume of goods output in the republic has increased 1.8 times and amounts to R9 billion. Heavy industry and machine building enterprises have increased their share. Over the last 7 years the volume of consumer services and household goods output has doubled and local industry output has increased 2.2 times. A brief period of time has seen the establishment of such new sectors as the industrial production of carpets, the manufacture of modern furniture, complicated household appliances, china, earthenware, and enamel crockery and utensils, and household chemical products.

The construction of major enterprises' branches in smaller towns, rayon centers, and rural population centers that have spare labor resources has become an efficient way of developing the sectors producing consumer goods. Over 400 branches have been set up in 1976-1982. Credit for this is due to the republican party organization and Comrade Sh. R. Rashidov personally, this is an economically justified and progressive experience worthy of dissemination.

The state of affairs concerning goods in general is not bad in the current 5-year plan, either. The republic has made high pledges for the remaining period -- to produce goods worth R1.2 billion in excess of plan.

All this is equally typical of the other republics, and this makes it possible at present to saturate the market with many types of goods. Under these conditions, industry is entering a new stage of its development, when the problems of dynamically renewing the range and raising the quality come to the foreground. It can be said without exaggeration that today quality is the key to the entire problem of providing goods for the people.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has repeatedly stressed that we need goods not to line the stores' display shelves but to satisfy well the people's needs for goods meeting standards. The times when people bought whatever was in the stores have long passed. Now they demand good, high-quality products.

It must be noted that measures are being taken in the republic in this direction. Many new products are being assimilated in production. About 1,500 varieties of goods bearing the state seal of quality are being produced. A number of production collectives react flexibly to the growing market requirements, and evidence of this can be seen in the republican exhibition of consumer goods. Many good products, which please the eye, are on show there.

The question of improving the quality has been raised properly and urgently in the republic. Just criticism is leveled at the leaders of enterprises which still manufacture old-fashioned goods in unpopular colors, which fail to satisfy market demand and pile up in the warehouses. There is also justified anxiety caused by the failure to fulfill the goods turnover plan.

The effects of party, soviet, and trade union organizations, of economic cadres, and of labor collectives engaged in the manufacture of consumer goods must be oriented toward the solution of the quality problems. The quality of production must become the yardstick for everyone's labor -- from the worker to the enterprise director. The socialist competition must be guided along these lines.

The CPSU Central Committee recently endorsed the initiative of leading enterprises which have given higher pledges for 1984-1985. They envisage to significantly improve the quality of manufactured goods through maximum utilization of existing reserves. This also is the purpose of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee resolution which endorsed the pledges by a number of republican enterprises. The workers and specialists are supporting this initiative and note that Uzbekistan's enterprises also have reserves for improving quality. The point is to create the necessary organizational and economic conditions for bringing them into action. It is important to nurture among the workers a sense of high responsibility and professional pride in the honor of the factory's or plant's trademark.

The conference, I. V. Kapitonov said, justly pays much attention to light industry questions. Its output accounts for 25 percent of the goods produced in the republic. This sector is developing at fast rates. During the last 5-year plan the volume of production output increased almost 50 pecent, with an additional 15 percent increase in the first 2 years of the current 5-year-plan. It is planned to invest R1.3 billion in this sector during the 11th 5-Year-Plan. The Andizhan Cotton Textile Combine is indicative in this respect, having been constructed quickly and well, and will, over the next few years, become one of the country's major textile enterprises. As we have seen, the Tashkent Textile Combine is being transformed through modernization.

Responding to the party's and the state's concern, the workers and employees in light industry have overfulfilled the targets for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan. The output growth rate has reached 15.8 percent against the planned 11.4 percent. The output of cotton textiles has increased 34 percent and the output of hosiery products -- 21 percent. The proportion of items bearing the state seal of quality is 34 percent of the total volume of output subject to certification.

These indicators are not at all bad. If we were, however, to compare them with the existing potential, the great reserves become immediately evident.

The level of capacity utilization in textile enterprises is 70 percent, and even less in a number of major combines. Many factors are at play here. One of them involves the difficulties in forming the labor collectives in reconstructed enterprises. The experience accumulated during the assimilation of production capacities in leading enterprises is still insufficiently utilized in the solution of this problem. We are talking mainly about the timely training of qualified cadres for the workers' professions and of specialists, and about the more active introduction of the team method and other progressive forms of labor organization and incentives. It is necessary to enhance the prestige of textile industry trades, primarily of spinners and weavers, and to make sure that the names of the best among them are known all over the republic.

Constant attention must also be given to the questions of ensuring that people settle down in production work and of improving the working people's working and living conditions. The leaders of the republic's enterprises and ministries who have tolerated the nonfulfillment of plans for the commissioning of housing and children's preschool facilities during the current 5-year plan must be reproached. This is even more inexcusable in view of the fact that the annual plans for the construction of other projects in the republic are being overfulfilled. It has to be constantly born in mind that the task set by the 26th CPSU Congress is to expand and improve the training of qualified workers from among all nationalities and ethnic groups inhabiting the republic. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stressed, this is necessary for the economy's development, as well as being politically important.

Last May's plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee set specific tasks before the group "A" industrial enterprises. Here, too, there are considerable reserves. One in four of these enterprises is not engaged in consumer goods manufacture. It is a statewide task to ensure the active participation by all sectors and each enterprise, regardless of their specialized field, in saturating the market with goods. The CPSU Central Committee approaches its solution with high standards of party exactingness.

The speaker went on to dwell upon questions of cotton growing, which are most directly concerned with consumer goods. Cotton's significance not only is not diminishing but is actually increasing. In the textile industry it accounts for 40 percent of the total volume of fibers used. Cotton textiles comprise over 60 percent of the total quantity of textiles manufactured in the country.

Uzbekistan produces two-third of the country's raw cotton. In each of the first 2 years of the 5-year plan the republic has provided the state with 6 million metric tons of "white gold," which is significantly more than the average annual procurement during the last 5-year plan. The cotton-growing farms are being increasingly saturated with machinery. Mechanized harvesting, in particular, has practically become the basic way of cotton picking. The achievements in cotton-growing have become possible thanks to the extensive organizational work by party and soviet organs and the cotton growers' selfless labor, who are producing increasingly higher yields under extremely complex conditions. Having visited Izbaskanskiy Rayon's 50-letiye Oktyabrya Sovkhoz and having met its remarkable workers, I. V. Kapitonov noted, we are convinced that the cotton grower must invest tremendous labor, skill, and all his soul to produce a good harvest.

An analysis shows that, in cotton production, too, quality now comes to the forefront. It is here, at the very first link of the technological chain, that the quality of future goods is assured.

Many of the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are steadily producing high-grade cotton. Nevertheless, over the last few years there has been a noticeable trend in a number of oblasts toward reducing the proportion of top-grade cotton, thus reducing the fiber yield. This is yet another reserve for the additional production of a raw material that is in short supply.

Cotton-ginning industry workers must actively struggle, together with the cotton farmers, for the quality of the cotton. This is exactly how the collective in Andizhan Oblast's Moskovskiy cotton-ginning plant see their tasks, and the plant shops are decorated with the right slogans: "Struggle for Quality -- the Main Task," and "Comrade, Remember! The Country's Textile Workers Expect Top Quality Products!" A considerable amount of work has been done in the republic to build up the capacities and retool the enterprises in this sector. New cotton procurement centers, cotton plants, and drying and ginning shops have come into operation. The state allocates considerable funds for this purpose and they must be utilized in a highly efficient manner.

And of course, the foremost task of all in the immediate future is the packing of cotton. Work rates must be speeded up and everything must be done so as to honorably fulfill this year's plans and socialist pledges.

Just over 2 months separate us from the end of the 5-year plan's third year. The party, state, and economic organization are faced with an important task, the successful completion of the year in all sectors of the economy. This is completely possible in the republic. In the first 9 months the growth of the volume of industrial production was 4.5 percent against the planned 4 percent. The annual plans for the production of potatoes, fruit, and vegetables and the 9-month targets for the sale of meat, milk, and eggs to the state have all been fulfilled. Good organization is now required for the rice harvest. The construction industry has entered an important stage. All planned projects must be brought into operation within the remaining time.

It is extremely important to consolidate the achieved levels so as to begin 1984 with confidence. This will be a notable year for the republic. It will mark the 60th anniversary of the Uzbek SSR and the Uzbekistan Communist Party. There is no doubt that the working people will celebrate this date with new successes in all sectors of communist building.

The republic's party aktiv is clearly aware of the tasks facing it and the ways to resolve them. The point is to provide the organizational backup for these tasks and mobilize the labor collectives for their fulfillment. A good opportunity for this is offered by the report and election campaign within the party. In the republic, just like all over the country, this campaign is proceeding in an organized manner with high level of activity by the communists.

The trend of the report and election campaign was determined by the well-known CPSU Central Committee resolution. It must be ensured that the proceedings at meetings and conferences also reflect the current issues recently discussed by the CPSU Central Committee. What I have in mind are the directives on questions of improving the socialist competition, raising the quality of consumer goods, improving the utilization of reclaimed lands, and the Central Committee resolution on the work of the Ministry of Railways party committee.

The meetings and conferences must provide maximum help in strengthening discipline and organization, developing the creative initiative of the masses, and improving the style of leadership. There must be a careful analysis of the state of affairs in the utilization of work time in each collective and a thorough examination of the implementation of requirements concerning all these matters.

I. V. Kapitonov emphasized in conclusion that the republic party organization is firm and cohesive. It is a glorious detachment of the CPSU and reliable mainstay of the CPSU's Leninist Central Committee. All this generates confidence that, under the leadership of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee and its bureau, the republic's communists and working people will continue to work persistently on the implementation of the party's directives and will comprehensively strengthen our multinational socialist state. (prolonged applause)